by MIRIAM VAN WATERS

Parents on Probation

PARENTS
on Probation

301.427
V285p

Parents on Probation

by MIRIAM VAN WATERS
Author of *Youth in Conflict*

NEW YORK
NEW REPUBLIC, INC.
1927

Copyright, 1927, by
NEW REPUBLIC, INC.

Printed in U. S. A.

To my Father and Mother to whose understanding and sturdy acceptance of the rôle of parents in the modern world this book owes its being.

To Mrs. Ruth Baker, who has patiently prepared the manuscript for print, my thanks and affection are due.

16289

CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTORY. PARENTS ON PROBATION 1

The point of view presented is not science but life as seen from a Juvenile Court. The Juvenile Court shows situations typical of all families. We have grown accustomed to thinking of children as if they were the only delinquents. Let us imagine the situation reversed. Let us consider the nature of parents who offend. Parents are on probation in the modern world. This is a highly favorable status from which to adjust. Parents must have the responsibility of being their own probation officers.

CHAPTER II: THE FAMILY IN SEARCH OF A GOAL 7

What are the objectives of the family? Does its function in society fulfill itself without reference to the fate of individuals? Our goals differ more than our methods. It is essential that we find a goal. The changed rôle of the family is bound up with the changed activities of the state. Our pattern of family life is influenced by what occupies human attention. Slavery and religion modify family goals. Our progress is apparent against the background of other philosophies of family life. Some peoples have held that discipline is not the parents' chief duty. Other groups can provide training but only the family can give the child security and love. The family's relationship to respect for property. We have taken too restricted a view of the household. Families which appear to have failed may give us the clew as to what constitutes success. Families may appear to have succeeded yet leave no biological or social inheritance. Devices for measuring the home. Some modern goals of family life: trustworthiness, courtesy, loyalty, the creative spirit, capacity for new experience, freedom from bondage to dogma, a desire to put truth in the first place.

PAGE

CHAPTER III: PROBLEMS PECULIAR TO PARENTS 31

The parent must gain an outlook upon his task in harmony with his limited authority. Numerous social resources have greatly restricted the field of parental activity. The parent must learn to use and to evaluate social resources without being engulfed by them. He must make his own contribution. The major problem of the parent is to interpret the changing world to the child. The parent must learn to thread his way through a maze of scientific theories and religious dogmas. The parent must know the "world of a child." The problem of gaining the respect of the child. The problem of weaning. The problem of sex. The problem of work. The problem of guidance. The problem of shared responsibility. The problem of prestige. The problem of privacy.

CHAPTER IV: NINETEEN WAYS OF BEING A BAD PARENT . . . . . .

A parent may be good while the children are young, yet become a bad parent when the children are older.

A parent is bad if he is not orientated in the modern world.

A parent who makes a faulty characterization of a child is bad.

A parent may be bad if some interest or impulse, however good in itself, becomes hypertrophied and grows at the expense of parental feeling.

A parent is bad who takes a fatalistic attitude toward a child's weakness, illness, or defect, and who cannot see behind a present handicap the background of latent strength.

A parent is bad who tries to make the "child fit the home," or the "home fit the child" and has not grasped the idea of democracy in family life.

A parent is bad who repudiates a child in dire need.

A parent is bad whose imagination is colored by an uncritical acceptance of vague rumors of scandal about young people. Such parents have no sense of proportion, are ready to accept the worst because it fits in with their theories. Adults may become the largest contributing factor in the breakdown of reputation, even of their own children.

A parent is bad who has a warped view of authority

PAGE

and is thus unable to make use of social resources.
Parents are bad who labor under the delusion that law-enforcement applies only to "others," those who live in poverty, or are of different race or culture.
A parent is bad who does not realize that with adolescence comes a tremendous pull of loyalty toward friends outside the family.
For a parent to become prematurely stabilized so that he cannot take in fresh experience, nor distinguish between major and minor values, is to become a bad parent.
Parents are bad who permit a thwarted love-life to pervert their relationship to their child.
A parent may be bad if the goal placed before the children is too immediate, and too easy, or is so concerned with money and comfort that the children become bored with life.
A parent is bad who is a parent only spasmodically, and then usually at the wrong time.
A parent is bad who permits the family atmosphere to become infected with his "inferiority complex."
A parent is bad who cannot shield a child from premature exposure to adult anxiety or perplexity.
A parent is bad who will not let a child grow up, who does all the talking, makes all the decisions, meets all the issues, and exercises perpetual chaperonage.
A parent is bad who does not wholeheartedly inculcate the idea of family formation for the next generation.

CHAPTER V: SOME MODERN OBSTACLES TO SUCCESSFUL PARENTHOOD 100

Encroachments on the prolongation of youth.
Law and dangerous ideals of play.
Exhaustion of modern parents.
Our failure to eliminate cruelty to children.
The task of the parent may be nullified by a social order which judges the child in the terms of the adult.
Our wrong attitude toward sex and family formation.
The widening of the "primary group."
The impermanence of modern homes and the destruction of natural loveliness.

PAGE

CHAPTER VI: WHO IS THE LEGAL OWNER OF THIS CHILD? 119

Studies from child custody cases.
The legal background of custody conflicts in old English Common Law.
The duty of protection.
The duty of education.
The power of parents over their children.
The duties of children to their parents.
A summary of ten custody cases which illustrate the fact that the principle of child welfare is often in opposition to the so-called rights of parents. Community attitudes are confused and sentimental. We need a new chivalry which will make it possible to shield children from adult selfishness.

CHAPTER VII: "I WOULD RATHER DIE THAN GO HOME" 168

Studies in Antagonistic Parent-child relationships.
The Los Angeles studies in family antagonisms.
Summary of the results.
The "baulked disposition."
Failure to develop adequate personality.
Some cases which appear to have family conditions which make for antagonism develop "normally."
Relation of the antagonistic personality to criminality.
Antagonism interferes with the acquisition of skill.
The relation of antagonism to sexual promiscuity.
Daydreaming, phantasy, and lying as the accompaniments of antagonism.
Surface incidents that cause antagonism.
Some practical suggestions to parents.
The antagonism resolved.

CHAPTER VIII: LEADERSHIP: PARENTS AND FRIENDS 212

Studies of children who lead others, or who are "led"—i.e., who find among their contemporaries an influence stronger than that of the family.
Here we are dealing with loyalty and the most mysterious forces in human experience. The problem presented to Juvenile Courts in dealing with "bad companionship." The Los Angeles case-studies of

PAGE

delinquent girl leaders. Comparison with normal girls in High School who become leaders. The ways in which delinquent girls exercise their destructive leadership. Factors in constructive leadership. Leadership is always linked with personal energy, "organic tensions" and the struggle of winning over handicap. A summary of family life conditions, school, neighborhood, recreation and church influences in the cases of the constructive and destructive girl leaders. Some practical suggestions to parents.

CHAPTER IX: PARENTS IN SEARCH OF EDUCATION 252

Can parents be educated?
Shall we educate parents?
What is parental education?
The beginnings of organized education for parenthood.
The parental education movement.
The Nursery School Idea.
Humanizing science for the benefit of parents.
Public School courses in child care.
Programs of parental education.
Evaluating the results of parental education.

CHAPTER X: THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF PARENTS WHO HAVE SUCCEEDED IN CHANGING THEIR ATTITUDES 280

The attitude toward the problem modifies the problem. The *aufgabe* and the *einstellung*. Experiences of parents in a class in parent-education. Description of procedure and method. Illustrations of changed attitudes. Parents who pool their problems. As parents change their attitudes they see problems of a deeper nature. Loneliness and fear in the adopted child. Masturbation. Celebrating successes.

CHAPTER XI: THE GLORIOUS ADVENTURE OF BEING GROWN UP 300

The individual, as well as the family, should have a goal. To-day we offer young people only a reduced image of themselves. In the 18th Century the middle-aged man was the center of culture. Rejuvena-

PAGE

tion is not a worthy goal. Our mature personalities are not understood. What we do when alone indicates our goals of maturity. Parental interference can be blamed for our not growing up. Modern goals such as adjustment leave a good deal to be desired. The modern man must concern himself with the predicament of his fellow-creatures.

CHAPTER XII: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 313

Comparison of the attitude of the Juvenile Court with that of parents. The relationship of parent and child requires perpetual adjustment. Things can never be settled once for all. Rules of action are inadequate. Family life is a task, not a remedy. The recommendation is to have faith in life.

BOOK LIST 319

INDEX 331

PARENTS
on Probation

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

PARENTS ON PROBATION

In our modern world, already so overcrowded and filled with clamor, one should be called strictly to account for producing a new book. For works of art or genuine literature no excuse need be given: like acts of love, they justify themselves because the expression seems so necessary and so beautiful. But why is it necessary to write a new book about human relationships? Has the writer so great a burden of scientific data that he must ease himself of a portion of it? Has light suddenly come flooding over the rim of a dark horizon? Has experience been so compelling that it must be shared? Surely the modern writer will ask himself these questions if he has any conscience.

This little book is not a contribution to science. It is not an authentic message by one who is very sure what ought to be said to parents baffled by changing situations and moralities. The writer sits in a juvenile court and works with scientists, social workers, teachers, parents, children, and members of the community who struggle to solve their human problems, problems limited to no special class or intelligence level, but recurring among all types of families, rich, poor, educated, not educated, white, black, those upon whom responsibility sits lightly, and those who care a great deal. To the court come

children who have violated laws made by adults of a far distant past, laws safeguarding property, conserving customs and regulations, many of them senseless, some based on eternal human verities. Handicapped, dependent, defective, and neglected children, children who file petitions for their protection against unfit or cruel parents, boys and girls whose parents or guardians say they are incorrigible, young children whose custody is sought by quarreling fathers, mothers and relatives, children who cannot get along in school, children complained of by neighbors, young people who marry under age without parental consent, children who are homeless, all these come to a modern juvenile court.

The court hearing has certain advantages over a private recital of grief in a clinic, confessional, laboratory, or an office of doctor or lawyer. There are the disadvantages of a certain formalism made necessary by legal traditions inherited from a time when almost nothing was known about the inner life of human beings, and childhood was not so much disregarded as utterly undiscovered. Hearings in courts of law ignore a good deal, but there is one invigorating thing about them; they demand straightforward and courageous speech. The gossip, the coward and the underminer show their true colors. The frankness which is demanded, the call for a physical bravery sufficient to make one say aloud in the presence of the family what one has long whispered behind backs, utterance of those slow-festering, unspoken accusations, the need for supporting vague hurts, grudges, wishes and prejudices with a little bolster of fact, however slender, all this appeal for *expression* of what ails us is tremendously stimulating, wholesome and cleansing. Often, after

it is over, the trouble dies down of itself. The crying void in the heart has found speech, the gesture has been completed without thwarting; then we turn to go home! Here are the members of the family whom we thought we hated. What more natural than that we slip into the old grooves of affection that existed before the trouble began?

In the court the child is the core of the inquiry, and tells his story privately, but at some time in the proceedings all the family must be assembled and their points of view taken note of. This is like looking now through one end of the telescope, then the other. The relative size and importance of the facts, their values, assume entirely different proportions and colors if we see them from the parental focus, or through the brilliant, direct, foreshortened lens of the child. Assuredly we gain tolerance in the process. Parents seem like children, and the children, as young boys do who are drafted into a desperate war, seem mobilized and rushed prematurely into the adult world to bear the brunt of our social reconstruction; they seem older, wiser, sadder and more sophisticated than their parents.

Some one may say the court is a poor place to see normal family life. But we do not know what normal family life is. As Chesterton has remarked: "To be in the weakest camp is to be in the strongest school." Sometimes family life appears at its best in court, winning over difficulties, challenging unbelievable handicaps, showing freshness and courage in situations that tax the wisdom of the strongest. One would not like to be deprived of the stark beauty of some of these lives, reconstructed at such cost. Then too, court families are not alone in their perplexities. Hardly a family in America does not have

to face the sickness, retardation, breakdown, suicide, offense or distortion of one of its members. These ills flow from family situations, from misunderstandings, from failure to grasp the laws of life, and most of them, scientists tell us, could have been prevented had parents and children known how to live together. Hardly a family in America is not engaging in the same practices, falling into the same attitudes, committing the same blunders which, carried to their logical conclusion, bring the court families to catastrophe.

We have grown so accustomed to dealing with children as if they were the only delinquents. Let us imagine the situation reversed. Then we would deal with parents under the familiar headings: delinquent parents, causation and treatment; types of offending, dependent, defective, and neglected parents; parents in unfit homes; parents in relation to jobs, companions, friends, teachers, clergymen, social workers and newspaper men; parents who have been given probation and made good; those who do not deserve probation and ought to be institutionalized in reformatories, hospitals, or prisons. Viewing the innumerable faults of parents, their responsibility for the sufferings of children who come to courts and clinics, we might conclude they are tolerated in the community only because we have no other place to put them.

It is wise to place parents on probation. Probation is a word which may be used in two senses. A nurse or civil service employee is a probationer when he is permitted to carry a limited responsibility and to practice the arts of his profession under supervision, but is thought not ready yet for a final appointment. Parents are in this class. No one

were satisfied with their performance. Their ability to do the whole job is questioned and the modern world is constantly devising new ways to assist them, or to encroach upon their field of activity. Probation also may be used to describe the status of one who has been labelled as an offender, but is thought worthy of help from science, religion and social work, provided he will cooperate in a plan for his own welfare and the protection of the community.

Probation used in this sense implies no stigma. The part of the offender has been examined and "diagnosed"; it is referred to only as a means for better understanding; he begins his fresh start today—this is all any honest person can ask.

Parents in their own eyes are actually on probation. They face self-criticism, criticism from their children, from grandparents, ministers, doctors, psychologists, press, criminologists, teachers and neighbors. This in no way differentiates them from the rest of the world. All our established institutions are on probation and seeking to justify themselves. Criticism of others, and a sense of dissatisfaction for all that goes on in the world is the rule today . . . the general verdict appears to be that other people ought to do their jobs better.

If parents are alarmed at the thought of being on probation let them remember that it is a highly favorable status from which to readjust. Probation is not a sentence; it is not an acquittal. The probationer always has a subsequent history. To be allowed to live in the open air in a world so fascinating, so full of change, motion, laughter, tears, to be permitted at all to take part in the thrilling spectacle of the twentieth century with its barbarism,

savagery and civilization so strangely mingled, to have brought a child forth at this particular time when human beings are on the eve of a tremendous renaissance, due to our discoveries and rediscoveries in human behavior, ought to make the parent nerve himself. Like the sturdy child who raises his face stained with tears and says to the judge: "Sure, I'll make good," so to-day parents should face the super-parent, which is mankind, with a resolute intent to demonstrate that faith and trust in them have not been misplaced.

One warning always should be given by the court in granting probation. It is true that the probationer is entitled to all the help available from doctors, psychiatrists and social workers, but his most important task is to make his own decisions. He will be fussed over a great deal, given all manner of advice, much of it contradictory; there will be people seeking to enslave, pamper and exploit him. If he has the independence of judgment to save his soul under these conditions, he is a good man. So the parent, in accepting probation will be flooded with advice and admonitions. Those unfortunate fathers and mothers who entrust the rearing of their children entirely to specialists prolong their tutelage and rob themselves of the lifeblood of their task. Parents, in the long run, like any other delinquents, must be their own probation officers.

CHAPTER II

THE FAMILY IN SEARCH OF A GOAL

WHAT is the family for? What should we demand of it? Shall we say a family is a success if it produces worthwhile individuals? Is it a failure if several of its members fail, or does its function in society fulfill itself without reference to the fate of individuals? At what point shall we pause and measure it? Never before were there so many answers to these questions. In the family of America all things are possible, all goals and values still fluid, but we should know where we are going. The family is still in the making. Its aims are but vaguely understood, even by those who give their lives in its service. Perhaps, to all great-hearted parents who see life simply, the goal is self-evident . . . merely to keep on going. Countless families, however, are seeking for a lighthouse. If the true use of the family could be made clear and its aims defined, many of our miseries would be avoided.

In child rearing, it is sometimes said we all seek the same ends; we differ only in methods. Nothing could be further from the truth. We differ tremendously in goals. There is no fixed taste among adults in the type of children they find desirable. The sight of a group of sturdy babies taking sunbaths in a Nursery School will be delightful to some parents, but will so displease others that they build a high board fence around their property to shut

out the revolting indecency. A school of boys and girls on friendly terms with their teachers, playing, working, building, thinking together without drudgery or fear, may seem ideal to some people; others will be suspicious: how can children learn anything where they are so happy? Frankness, initiative, courage and gayety, which some parents regard as priceless characteristics in their children, may be seen by neighbors as insolence and impiety. Mean adults are pleased when their children begin to grow shrewd, self-assertive and calculating. It is often evident in court that parents are secretly proud of their children's delinquency, certainly not of the actual law-breaking, but of the personality traits that led up to it. Much of the grief of parents is caused by children who turn unexpectedly into courses they abhor, although these may be considered highly desirable from another view-point. An artist may be saddened to see his son develop into a competent business man. An efficient, organizing mother may experience the deepest humiliation when her children turn out shy, ultra-studious and indifferent to popularity.

How could it be otherwise than that our goals should conflict when we live in a time where all civilizations, ideals, standards, manners and morals jostle one another. Only an extraordinary pedantic person is so blinded that he says we all have the same aims in child welfare.

Although we disagree in goals we all tend to use the same means, unless we watch our step. Ironically enough, groups in the community who have united to secure justice, or protection of the helpless, or purity, use methods indistinguishable from the tactics of their enemies. So in family life parents tend

to use identical means for securing their results. "Means" are merely habitual or impulsive ways of reaction.

Parental behavior does not differ in this respect from child behavior. Again and again we repeat some action although it is evident that it has failed. The conditions for successful learning are absent. The goal is not visualized, there is no immediate sense-experience to warn us when we are wrong, or reward us when we are right; the "penalty" is so remote that, when it falls, we attribute it to bad luck, or the ingratitude and perversity of our children. When we find ourselves blocked, or resisted, when we are pushed to extremity by the actions of human beings, we are all extremely likely to display some form of emotional tantrum, with the object of punishing, frightening, humiliating, or inflicting suffering upon those who oppose us. Only a clear view of our goal and the utmost self-discipline will lead us out of the muddle.

The significance of changing goals of family life.

The most important change is the choice we offer to the individual as to whether he will, or will not, found a family. Modern society is based on what is believed to be the right and well-being of the individual. No longer is the household such an essential element in our social structure that marriage is compulsory, as it was anciently, almost to the point of conscription.

Speaking broadly, the outstanding difference between the ancient and modern family is that formerly "the family aided the *status quo*"; to-day it shelters the individual until he is old enough to go his own road. This is no longer clearly mapped.

He is bound only by economic and social conditions. There is no appointed place for him. Parents suggest but do not compel, and, in America, tradition is not offended when the son does not duplicate the life of the father. In fact there are so many roads . . . we tend to lose the way.

The different rôle of the family is bound up with the changed activities of the state. When war and religion were the chief interests of government, the feudal, or patriarchal type of family flourished. To-day, when, as Roscoe Pound points out, the activities of the state are chiefly legislation and administration, we have an entirely new type of family.[1]

It is hard for us to realize how our pattern of family life is influenced by human interest, or, as newspapers say, by what occupies public attention. Every decade or so we state *the* burning human problem differently, but at bottom it is the same problem: how shall we live together? As we change opinions about war, slavery, religion, property, so we modify our family goals. Most individuals are unaware of this subtle influence. The details of to-day's life, the things prepared to-day for to-morrow, hold us and comfort us, as the child is assured of the continuity of his world, when after supper he hears to-morrow's soup bubbling on the fire. But it is not alone catastrophes that wipe out families; their inner nature is constantly being destroyed and rebuilt by psychological and social forces that surround them.

[1] Pound, Roscoe, Dean of Harvard Law School: "Preventive Justice and Social Work." Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1923.

How these forces operate we may glimpse by solid research into our own and ancient cultures, or we may catch their overtones in literature, press, popular songs, legal decisions and hymns.

For example, when slavery was a part of our domestic life, how natural it was for a newspaper editor to write: "Northern free society is burdened with a servile class of mechanics and laborers unfit for self-government, and yet clothed with the attributes and powers of citizens. Master and slave is a relation in society as natural and necessary as *parent* and *child,* and northern states will yet have to introduce it." [2]

His readers would have seen nothing amiss in this analogy, yet to-day it is simply unthinkable. Our attitude towards the nature of the child's relationship to his parents has so changed that we do not interpret his dependence as servility. To the democracy of the family the child makes a contribution in spite of his economic helplessness.

How such an institution as slavery modified the everyday life of the homes of that period has never been traced, but that its atmosphere infected family relationships we cannot doubt.

The influence of prevailing religious doctrines has a profound effect upon the goals of the family. Old hymns, as they jog along into doggerel, reveal this better than formal statements of the articles of religion.

A hymn book printed in Philadelphia about 1838 has the following, under caption of the Children's Hour:

[2] Quoted from the *Richmond Inquirer* in Carl Sandburg's "Life of Lincoln." Italics ours.

Ye careless ones, oh, hear betimes,
The voice of sovereign love;
Your youth is stained with many crimes,
But mercy reigns above.

"True, you are young, but there's a stone
Within the youngest breast,
Or half the crimes which you have done
Would rob you of your rest."

Parents who complacently sent their little children to sing such songs would have a very different conception of the rôle of the family than parents of to-day who guard their children from unnecessary fears, and would object to the phantom of sin leering at them from an old hymn book. Even the chaplain in a boys' reformatory would hardly go so far as to suggest that the young delinquents be robbed of their rest by their sense of guilt.

A modern mother said she did not teach her young child the Ten Commandments because she did not wish her to know that "people had existed who behaved like that."

The naïve way in which a kindly soul of another century may express in his religious writings a philosophy of family life abhorent to decent parents to-day is noted by Karl De Schweinitz. A clergyman of the 17th century states benevolently:

"Lord, what faults I correct in my son I commit myself. I beat him for dabbling in the dirt, whilst mine own soul doth wallow in sin; I beat him for trying to carve his own meat, yet am myself not content with the state Thy providence hath carved unto me; I beat him for crying when he is about to go

to sleep, yet I fear verily I myself shall cry when Thou callest me to sleep with my fathers." [3]

Here is none of the violent pleasure some perverted adults find in beating. Inevitably, rhythmically, the words flow without rancor or malice straight from the heart of a father who doubtless tempered with mercy his cruel religion and its resulting treatment of infants. How bewildered this parent would be in a modern Nursery School or Juvenile Court. The sight of a little child playing in earth and sand no longer suggests "wallowing in sin," self-help is taught encouragingly, we do not beat it out as a sign of stiff-necked pride; the infant who cries when he goes to sleep, we know now, has been spoiled or frightened, possibly by the evocation of the same ghosts which terrified the death-beds of the parents of 1642. We have made progress.

It is only by looking back over the road we have traveled that we realize the gradual change in our philosophy of family life.

Some family goals of civilizations other than our own.

The discipline and training of children is popularly supposed to be the parents' chief duty. Under some systems of family life this task is not theirs primarily.

For example, the Chinese practice exchanging sons, "when of the right age, for purposes of instruction, so that the necessary discipline should not be exercised by members of the same family and so vitiate the love between parents and children." [4]

[3] Fuller, Rev. Thomas: "Good Thoughts for Bad Times," quoted by Karl De Schweinitz in *The Family*, June, 1926.

[4] Wilhelm, Richard. Keyserling's "The Book of Marriage," p. 137. Harcourt, Brace. New York, 1926.

Chinese children are notoriously obedient to parents; even in America their respect is not uprooted, yet the conscious goal of family life is not obedience but affection. The state and a network of tradition supply the necessary sanctions for submission to authority.

The orthodox Hebrew mother sometimes refuses to discipline her son: "If I am harsh to him, who will say prayers for me when I am gone?" If the aim in rearing children be to advance one's spiritual welfare in the next world, then anything which chills the child's voluntary tenderness should be avoided. If the aim be the endurance of love, then other groups, outside the family, should be held responsible for inflicting punishments incidental to training.

These views of family life are widely held among primitive peoples. The tenderness of primitive parents to their young children, their reluctance to beat or scold them, has been noted by observers all over the world, as well as the astonishing good behavior of the children. Later on, usually at puberty, comes their submission to rites and ceremonies, often extremely painful, followed by the most rigorous instruction and training. But the parents leave such things to outsiders.[5]

Many modern psychiatrists believe that the parents' chief duty is to surround the child shelteringly, and to implant in him the feeling of security. Alfred Adler states the function of the mother is "to teach the child to understand boundless trustworthiness, and to make herself an example of noble womanhood."

[5] Van Waters, Miriam: "The Adolescent Girl Among Primitive Peoples." *Journal of Religious Psychology.* Clark University Press, 1913.

Bernard Glueck compares the rôle of the parent to that of the physician in dealing with certain types of nervous patient—"First spoil, and then wean him." It seems likely that lack of parental kindness during the period of childhood deprives the human being of an element absolutely essential to spiritual growth. As with mothers' milk, there is only one time for it. Hunger for it later is "abnormal," just as excessive craving for sympathy is. We may be filled with compassion for these ego-centered folk, but we can never have a sense of community with them.

A goal which we value highly in modern life is the winning and holding of property. When this is an end in itself, it casts a shadow over human relationships. We accuse and punish children for "trespass" when they escape from the city streets and intolerable sub-divisions, and stray into open spaces to play. A grown-up son or daughter may resent the care and maintenance of aged parents; only in certain conditions will the law compel support; rarely does a man lose friends because he is mean to his parents. Parents cast off their spendthrift children without losing the respect of their neighbors. The idea of having to support superfluous aunts, uncles, cousins, brothers and sisters, is not congenial; we pity those who undertake it and think something is wrong with people who have too strong a "family sense." Only a few modern families feel bound to see that the helpless and poor in their neighborhoods are provided for. Our sense of responsibility has narrowed till it includes the care of husband, wife, and one or two children. We call them good citizens if they take care of themselves. We think it extraordinarily praiseworthy if

they support a homeless relative, or send some "strange" child through school, or contribute to social work.

How painfully we teach our children "respect for other people's property," yet, after centuries, larceny is troublesome in every private club, school, or boarding house, no matter what the economic or cultural level.

Would we get better results if we put our instruction in different terms, emphasizing honesty as an incidental factor in sound personal relationships, a thing flowing out of our feeling for the respect due to personality.

Other peoples have looked upon property differently. In India, for example, the householder's property is at the disposal of a wide circle of kin. The giving away of property to "outsiders" is a duty to oneself. Its blessing is on the giver, who advances spiritually, whereas the receiver is merely comforted materially.

One of the saddest aspects of our family life is our failure to provide a vital place for parents who have fulfilled their responsibilities. Suddenly their task is over. The children have fled the home through the door of marriage, business, or the current cult of emancipation. Up to this point the goal of the family has been contained in food, clothes, health, money-making, anniversaries, and housecleaning. If the parents had some secret hope, some vague vision of life beyond the narrow domestic walls, they were too absorbed, shy or inarticulate to mention it to the children. Fathers, particularly, are prone to believe that any sensible person would know the purpose of all their toil. The children, in the meantime, see only the behavior of their par-

ents; to them it is endless preparation. For some reason the party never comes off.

When the grown-up children return, they attempt to recapture their childhood. The parents snatch at this false comfort. Every one is living in the past as if there were no place else to go. American families are arrested for the most part on a pre-adolescent level. They seem unable to leap the barrier into maturity. This is a tremendous misfortune.

The processes of family life are delightful. The journey itself is a lovely goal, but at the end, what?

When parents in middle age are bereft of occupation and interest with the departure of their children, various comforters arise, missing, as comforters generally do, the whole point, unless they are talking about their own troubles: "Children have always done this, it is natural"; "Take up some hobby, busy yourselves about something else"; "Wait for the grandchildren." (Too often, when the grandchildren come, the process is repeated with added anguish and resentment.) "Find your satisfaction in the achievements of your children." "Become adjusted; realize that emancipation of the children from the parents is one of the great goals of mental hygiene." All this is useless to parents who have no goals of their own.

Our trouble is that we have taken too restricted a view of the household. Tagore [6] writes: "In spite of her exaltation of the household estate, India did not look upon this as man's ultimate stage . . . the home must be given up in due course, in quest of the infinite. . . . Even to-day, we see our house-

[6] Tagore, Rabindranath: "The Indian Ideal of Marriage," from "The Book of Marriage," arranged and edited by Keyserling, Count Hermann. Harcourt, Brace. New York, pp. 98-122.

holders, when their children are grown up, leaving their homes to spend the rest of their lives in some place of pilgrimage."

We cannot copy the goals of another people, but there are innumerable elements in modern life from which a creative mind could construct a worthwhile goal. It is a problem of holding two threads, one rooted in the present, the other ascending far out of sight.

Families which appear to have failed.

The concept of failure may be the beginning of a constructive effort. Recently a group of homeless girls in an adjustment school were asked to write on the topic: "Children of 1936, what may we expect for them in ten years, what are the chief tribulations of childhood to-day?" A sixteen-year-old girl wrote:

> "I do not know myself what is the matter with the world. It is certain that it is something or there would not be so many girls in trouble. One thing I found in my own life was that my mother trusted me too much. I think it was my own fault too. If a boy or a girl wants to go to a show let the mother take them. I think the mother and father should try to show the children a good time as much as it is possible. Just as much as they think they can pay or can stand to pay. I would like to see the world change by the mother and the father trying to make a home that will mean home to the child. Maybe it would not be much, but if they had plenty to eat, plenty to wear and a home that is fit to live in, they would be happy and comfortable. I think children should also try to stay

at home and help the mother with the home and small children, if any.

"I think there is something lacking in marriage vows. I don't know just what unless it would be to love and cherish their children and no matter what comes up, to stay together and take care of them."

Thus, from a girl whose mother had deserted, remarried, and redeserted, whose father had failed to provide, a child who had had two sets of stepparents, and was none the better off, comes wisdom. In her case it is not merely verbal. She took the first opportunity for service that offered, and entered a training school for nurses, where she is distinguished for kindness to children.

The mother of Jane and Martha entered the court room defiantly, her lips plastered with rouge, her wide hat-brim pulled rakishly over one eye-brow. Jane, aged sixteen, was a gang-leader, a boisterous nuisance in school, and recently had been the "kid" in a newspaper scandal involving those who provided bootleg for sailors. Martha, aged nine, was about to enter the movies, and looked too frail to assume this burden of providing for the family. It seemed so obvious that this mother had failed. The district attorney thought so too. She barely escaped jail on the charge of being too kind to Jane's sailors. The Court told the mother she was a failure.

"What do you want me to do? I'll do anything you say. I suppose I have failed. I didn't know anything about a home. I had a stepmother. I can tell you one thing: I have done better by my children than she did by me. No one ever gave me any ideas about home life—whatever—see?"

This mother stood ready to put into practice a thing we all talk about but rarely have courage for; she was ready to change her whole way of life, giving up parties, and friends, and conforming to a probation officer's standards. Precisely where did her failure lie? The case before this one involved the children of respectable, self-denying parents, whose children, nevertheless, turned out as badly as Jane. Moreover, when Jane was sent away to school she developed such sturdiness of character and initiative that it would be impossible to say that her early years had been a total liability. If we used the success of offspring as a measuring scale, and viewed Jane on the day of her graduation, her frivolous young mother would not come off so badly.

When shall we pause to measure? A boy of fourteen was about to finish his sophomore year in high school when his father committed suicide by throwing himself down an elevator shaft in a building where he worked as janitor. The boy had three sisters, one older and two younger. He assumed charge of the household. He suggested that the older girl go to work as milliner. He slaved as messenger boy to a German hardware merchant who beat him. In off hours he made trout-fishing flies, getting up in the middle of the night to ride his bicycle into the country in search of feathers. Fishermen aided him in selling. He obtained a good position in a sportsman shop. Later he had one of his own. He married, had two children. When the youngest one was ten he killed himself. Why? In his industrious life he had no time for close friends. No one ever knew. There are many individuals who pay their debts to their families, fulfill their obligations as

parents, and pass on, leaving no clew as to what they thought of success, or failure.

The question often arises, What is the value of social case-work in behalf of families who cannot care for themselves economically? Those who look at the matter from the eugenic point of view doubt the wisdom of attempting to preserve these homes. They point out the increase in children who are inferior intellectually and express the view that social workers are cherishing delinquents and defectives when they aid families who have sunk below the margin of self-support.

Should we preserve by social case-work families unable to care for themselves? Fortunately, we have some concrete evidence. The case records compiled by Miss Breckinridge [7] show how vastly more important for our ultimate social welfare are human relationships than economic factors. It is a mistake to think these so-called marginal families are more responsible than normal families for filling our psychiatric hospitals and penal institutions. As we learn more, we find that constructive responses to home life, and the normal growth of the emotions are of greater significance than economic or intellectual superiority.

A recent study of conduct problems in public school children, made by M. E. Haggerty, who studied eight hundred pupils in Minneapolis, showed that fifty-one per cent were reported to have undesirable behavior traits.[8] Studies of children whose

[7] Breckinridge, Sophinsba P.: "Family Welfare Work in a Metropolitan Community." University of Chicago Press, 1924, p. 938.

[8] "The Incidence of Undesirable Behavior in Public School Children." *Journal of Educational Research*, 1925, Vol. XII, pp. 102-122.

families were receiving aid from a family welfare agency showed about thirty-one per cent whose conduct was troublesome.[9]

These studies need not lead us to conclude that children known to social workers show a smaller proportion of bad behavior than is characteristic of children in general. They do suggest, however, wherever kindness, trustworthiness, affection and laughter are found in family life they may make up for economic deprivations, over-crowding, poor sanitation, and lax housekeeping.

Families which appear to have succeeded.

In a little apartment stylishly furnished live a mother and three grown-up sons. The sons take part in the housekeeping and provide an adequate income. The mother keeps to her bed, or arm chair. Twenty-five years ago this was a flourishing family. Father, mother and six children lived on an estate which had been "in the family" for four generations. Everything was kept up to standard. The amount of cooking, sewing, cleaning and didactic instruction that went on there was enormous. Upon any regimen less cumbrous the mother looked down as shiftless. Her husband died when the children were ready to care for themselves. She summoned them to her side. Two daughters had married; ultimately they rejoined their husbands. The sons remained. None of them have the moral energy to leave. This family has run its course. Of what avail has it been? It is a failure biologically; socially there is

[9] Blanchard, Phyllis, Ph.D., and Paynter, Richard H., Ph.D.: "Socio-Psychological Status of Children from Marginal Families." Given at a meeting of the American Psychological Association, December 30, 1926. Reprinted in *The Family*, March, 1927.

no inheritance proceeding from it. Its tragedy does not lie in its extinction, but in the fact that it served as a model to the less aristocratic families in the neighborhood, and its goal-idea is still followed by countless homes.

Outworn traditions may ruin families. The conduct of Guenivere was inexplicable. She came of a long line of military ancestors. When she was twelve her mother died and her father remarried. The mother had been gay and attractive, after the manner of army women, but something she had done made her lose caste. Guenivere's father never mentioned her, and the stepmother merely cautioned Guenivere not to be like her. The family lost their money, and moved to a little hard-working neighborhood where gallantry, glory, charm, the attributes held desirable by army boys and girls, were out of place. When Guenivere became delinquent with taxi-drivers and schoolboys, her family was distracted. No one had sympathy for her. As a matter of fact all the traditions on which she had been brought up contributed to this logical outcome.

Families who fail to perpetuate themselves, and those whose goals are rooted in outworn traditions, cannot be said to succeed, no matter how prosperous and important they appear at any given cross-section.

Measuring the home.

Homes are so different in quality and standards that it is difficult to classify them. Certain objective environmental facts and social structures can, however, be measured. The need of a practical grading scale was evident first in the field of juvenile delinquency. Since then it has been found useful in studying environmental factors in the homes of the

feeble-minded, in evaluating foster-homes, and homes where children are placed for adoption. The grading of homes is now a recognized phase of sociological investigation. Its importance to parents in general lies in its challenge to formulate their own objectives.

In 1916 Dr. Harold Williams, Director of Research in the Whittier State School, California, published his scale for grading home conditions.[10] "The scale is intended to assist in determining only the *general social level* represented by the home, and the extent to which it is favorable, on the whole, to the best interests of the children." The value of possessing a uniform basis for the judgment of social workers in analyzing the family backgrounds of their clients was soon apparent, and this scale is now in very general use.

The data is secured by a trained field worker who visits the home. Items are listed as follows:

I. Necessities: (a) income; (b) food and clothing; (c) shelter; (d) furnishings; (e) comforts.

II. Neatness: (a) interior sanitation; (b) interior arrangement; (c) exterior sanitation; (d) exterior arrangement; (e) use of equipment.

III. Size: (a) accommodation; (b) arrangement; (c) convenience; (d) number of residents; (e) exterior spaces available.

IV. Parental conditions: (a) character; (b) harmony; (c) reason for separation, if living apart; (d) presence at home (the extent to which the parents are actually in the home); (e) adjustments due to the absence of one or both parents.

[10] *Journal of Delinquency,* November, 1916, pp. 273-286. Reprinted 3rd edition October, 1920. Bulletin No. 7, Department of Research, Whittier State School.

V. Parental supervision: (a) the interest taken by the parents; (b) the methods of discipline; (c) the fairness of treatment; (d) parental example; (e) the extension of the supervision.[11]

Each of the five main items is given a grade which represents its relative value on a scale of points from one to five inclusive. These are recorded on a standard score sheet which contains 122 condensed sample reports on home conditions (20 to 25 samples for each of the five items). The resulting score is called the Home Index. Averages have been secured for various social levels. "The average index of a miscellaneous group of homes of non-delinquent children was found to be twenty-two. The latter were not average homes, however, and hence do not represent homes among the population as a whole. In general, it may be said that homes grading above twenty points are favorable, within a reasonable interpretation of the term; that most homes grading below ten points are of a very low social level; and the average Western home is likely to fall between ten and twenty, perhaps nearer the higher of these two scores." [12]

This study was followed by the working out of a neighborhood scale with a view "to estimating the quality of neighborhoods in their relation to numerous social problems." Such matters as size and appearance of homes, yards and buildings, provision for water, garbage, sewage, gas and electricity, condition of roadways, recreational facilities, open play spaces, educational and religious establishments, nearness to such unfavorable institutions as saloons, pool-halls, stock-yards, police stations and jails,

[11] "Guide to the Grading of Homes," pp. 4-9.
[12] P. 13.

study of the social status of the residents, and the average quality of homes, were included in this score sheet.[13]

Neighborhood ratings have been secured for delinquent and truant boys, and some students are now at work estimating the average quality of neighborhoods for large groups of unselected children.

It would seem comparatively easy to measure homes and neighborhoods on their structural side. Our difficulty arises when we try to capture the meaning of the home to its members. How, indeed, shall we measure the strength of family relationships? Is the concept of measurement of any value here? On the face of it, "science" seems to have little to offer. Yet there is no harm in clear statement of the aims of families.

A beginning has been made: a hardy pioneer in this field is Dr. B. S. Richards,[14] who for four years has been conducting classes for parents and projects on family relationships. "Why do we maintain homes," what do they offer, just what must the home do to meet its objectives? These and similar questions have resulted in vigorous discussion among the parent classes conducted by Dr. Richards. "After several attempts to establish a working schedule in the home, it was found that this could not be done unless the home was organized on a democratic plan in which parents and children gathered in the family council and discussed how to live together. This plan does not take authority away from the parents, but gives them more oppor-

[13] Clark, Willis W., M.A., and Williams, J. Harold, Ph.D.: "A Guide to the Grading of Neighborhoods." Bulletin No. 8, Department of Research, Whittier State School, California, July, 1919.

[14] State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah.

tunity to advise and to be consulted by the children. It gives a child an opportunity to set his own standards."

Plans worked out from these classes have been carried out in the rural districts of the state. Specialists from the college are merely advisers. The parents themselves have taken the initiative.

A more recent project is that of the Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene, under the leadership of Dr. W. E. Blatz, Director of the Institute for Child Welfare, University of Toronto. An evaluation of the family atmosphere—the effect of coöperation, disagreement, indifference, coddling, brutality, nagging, favoritism, inconsistency, frightening, interference, strictness, frankness, teasing, quarreling, jealousy, seclusive or friendly relationships—has been studied. "Results" on the statistical side are, of course, meager. But this is an important beginning.

However great are the difficulties in reducing to orderly statement the complexities of family life, we should not shirk it. As we come to state the goals of families, we see they are for the most part abstract, owing their value to what is put into them by human beings.

Some modern goals of family life.

Any group dealing with children should first of all maintain in them a steadfast faith in the trustworthiness of life. For primitive parents this was easy because they believed in it themselves. We should avoid the feeling of futility, that sense of hopelessness which takes its beginning in the little child when he finds all his efforts, all his expression, beating up against a stone wall, and ends in the adult

with total doubt, suspicion and despair. There is no special time when trustworthiness can be taught. No day in family life is more important than any other, no period in the life of the individual has more value than any other. The parent who cherishes the infant, and neglects the twelve-year-old, or the adolescent, is not a good parent. Indifference to the claims of any member of the household, cruelty to the aged, ridicule of the youth, anything which cheapens the life of any human being, destroys faith in the power of the home as a shelter.

The surface is tremendously important. The paint advertisement, "Save the surface and you save all," has more significance than we realize. As in the individual embryo the outer layers turn in and become the central nervous system, so in human relationships the "surface" is not something put on, but something thrown up from the depths. As the skin has an intimate relation to all that is underneath, so the external covering of our souls, our speech, gestures, manners and attitudes, are a covering for the deep needs of our being. Courtesy is the chief rule of ethics in our intercourse with our fellows. Courtesy in family relationships is what the skin is to the individual body, a screen over parts that are intolerably sensitive. By keeping the surface intact, we preserve the health of the whole social organism.

The family should teach the value of loyalty. Other groups are necessarily concerned with training, discipline and hardening, but where can we learn the sense of belonging, if not in the family? The delinquent child, separated from unworthy parents and linked for a time to individuals who have higher standards, in schools, clubs, and organiza-

tions, finally comes to feel that the ground has fallen away beneath his feet. He must return where he *belongs*. He would be the first to admit that the other individuals were cleaner, more honest, kindlier, but he remains a stranger in their midst. This is the secret of those curious and disconcerting relapses into savagery, barbarism, or crime that so many promising children take in the end, after having been "rescued" by missionaries or reformers. By nature the child is committed to the family. No substitute can be conceived by art or social work, still less science.

The family should have a creative spirit. As there has been a change in scientific thought about the family, in that we see it no longer an especial aid to the *status quo*, so should individual parents recognize their function.

The whole world now turns to the individual. Life is astir in personalities as never before. Each one of us is conscious of whole areas of untaken land in the soul of man, some never-yet-asked contribution. "What divine drink wouldst thou have, my God, from this overflowing cup of my life?" [15]

The child asks this as he seeks new experience. The family must shelter him during his immaturity and must stiffen him to resist the encroachments of group stupidity.

It is hard for us to realize the obstacles the old social order placed in the way of achieving fresh solutions, even of material problems. Burgess has noted how the plow invented in 1792 was rejected by American farmers on the theory that "cast iron poisoned the lands."

[15] Tagore.

In England in 1306, in the time of Edward I, "a citizen was tried, condemned and executed for burning 'sea-cole' in the City of London." [16]

The introduction of bathtubs in this country subjected their unauthorized users to fines and imprisonment. These are useful illustrations to help the parent to understand the far greater difficulties the child who has a new idea about living must face.

To free the individual from bondage to dominant popular theological and academic superstitions should be one of the aims of the family. Love of truth comes about naturally in homes where children are surrounded by adults interested in their spontaneous experimentation. The family council which permits discussion and welcomes a child's ideas is the right soil for a constructive relation to new experience. Children who are compelled through fear, either of the power of their parents to hurt them physically, or of their more dreadful power to develop timidity and evasion through moral sternness, find it impossible later on to seek the truth.

The child who has learned to be afraid of *persons* faces the world with tragic inability to take sides. He will not allow himself to be hurt. All of his sorrows and joys are formal and remote. To him Mary Queen of Scots is real but not Sacco and Vanzetti.

There is a danger in making family goals too specific and concrete. In the family the child should become a free individual, with an increasing sense of his responsibility to other persons for the general welfare.

[16] Burgess, Ernest W.: "The Function of Socialization in Social Evaluation." University of Chicago Press, 1916, p. 17.

CHAPTER III

PROBLEMS PECULIAR TO PARENTS

WHEN we penetrate into the heart of the matter, we learn that in some situations science has nothing to say to parents. The task demanded of them is too overwhelming.

A mother attended a class in parent-education systematically, learning everything the instructor had to give; often she sat aloof with a look of doubt on her face. She was silent when parents discussed their problems. One day she said: "What would you do in this case? A mother has three children, the oldest is a boy of fifteen. He is the most beautiful child I have ever seen. He was in the third year of high school. While diving into the swimming pool he hit his head and broke his neck. You cannot blame the school authorities, the pool was safe. You cannot blame the parents, he had been trained as an athlete and had taken the dive dozens of times. For a year he has been lying in a harness. With this sort of fracture a two-year life-expectation is all the most skillful doctor can hold out. He lies there, reading, talking, laughing. Since this accident we have learned that his personality is remarkable. You could not believe that a boy could show so much wisdom, sweetness, unostentatious heroism."

The women in the class said nothing. Suddenly they saw that all the difficulties they had discussed melted before a great *reality.*

"The mother is my sister," said the woman.

Let us never be smug in addressing parents. A "preparedness," to use Adolf Meyer's phrase,[1] is required of them beyond anything we ask of teachers, doctors, or social workers.

The parent must gain an outlook upon his task in harmony with his limited authority.

The problems to be solved by parents have changed completely in recent years. To make a sweeping generalization, we may say that his technical problems have been met for him, in much the same sense that his food, housing, water-supply, drainage, sewerage, lighting, heating, and transportation needs have been supplied. In these matters he must use skill in applying the discoveries of science or he may easily blow his house up. So in child care. The fundamental principles of sleep, diet, clothing, exercise, are ready for any parent who cares to learn them. Most of the difficulties which annoy parents, how to gain obedience, how to form desirable habits, how to avoid lying (*children's* lying!), fears, food-fads, temper-tantrums, jealousy, shyness, are no longer insurmountable. A wealth of good, tested advice is available.[2] Parents should not feel anxious about these matters, which, however baffling, are merely the alphabet of the parent's task. They should come to grips with something more fundamental. Their outlook must change in harmony with their modern rôle.

It is natural for parents to believe that they create their children and own them. Animals behave to-

[1] Meyer, Adolf: "What Can a Democracy Do About Eugenics and Child Welfare?" National Committee for Mental Hygiene. New York.

[2] *See* book-list.

ward their young as if they were a peculiar, delightful sort of property. Human parents, remembering the uniquely *personal* experience of having a child, the helpless dependence of the infant and the unconcern of the rest of the world for so many years, find it extraordinarily hard to adapt themselves to their biological and social status. Parents do not *create* children; the part they play in physical heredity is small; they *produce* children, *i.e.,* "lead them forth" out of the mysterious life-stream. Later the child is to become a creator, a *builder,* as the Hebrew term for child suggests. If parents have a creative rôle it is in forming the personality of their children, through the medium of actions, speech and emotions.

As to the parents' authority, we see that it has diminished in harmony with the modern concept that they are not owners, nor sole arbiters of the fate of the child. No parent can determine the kind of rearing he will give his child unless he agrees to certain accepted norms. Let us deal with physical care first.

A mother, having embraced one of the food-fads of the moment, was feeding her child on nothing but orange juice. After a few weeks of this diet, the child became so emaciated that the neighbors complained. The public health nurse visited: "You have no right to interfere. This is my child. You cannot say I neglect it." The mother believed this because she did not "run around" to dances, because the child did not cry, nor "disturb the neighbors." Finally she had to be brought before the court. She smiled with the obdurate fanaticism of one whose life has suddenly become meaningful by the intake of one new idea. The court said:

"By persisting in this course your baby is smaller than other children of his age. If you had fed him properly you would have a large, healthy baby."

"But I like a small baby," replied the mother.

Why could the court proceed with good conscience to sever, at least temporarily, this relationship between mother and child? Because minimum standards of physical care have been learned and accepted by practically every one. If parents fail, it does not matter whether their intentions were good, or ill; the state has assumed the right to interfere. In the long run the state may do no better; the child may be put on a balanced diet, he may not be "neglected," all physical requirements may be met by the "Board of Children's Guardians," yet the child may not thrive. Still we have such faith in modern scientific care, and we have come to regard the life of an individual child as so public a concern, that we do not hesitate to say to a parent: "You have no right to follow your whim, if it runs counter to our standards."

We are not so clear about injuries inflicted out of sight. We have not agreed on how much damage done a child's mental and spiritual life will justify removal from parents. When older boys and girls come to court we see their young sisters and brothers warped by unwise coddling, harshness, or nagging; we see children being spoiled or poisoned by the very atmosphere of the families in which they live; yet because norms of mental health are still so vague, and the effects of their violation so intangible, we cannot "save" these children. A parent will be legally adjudged cruel if he chains a child up in the cellar, or leaves bruises on the flesh, but we lack the imagination to be shocked at treatment which slowly

undermines the child's mental health. We have legal precedents for believing that it is only a question of time before the parents' psychological handling of his child will be subjected to the scrutiny of the state. If the British Chancellor, Lord Eldon could take Shelley's children away from him because his religious beliefs were offensive, or the State of Washington [3] can remove a little boy from his family and place him out for adoption because he had been taught by his parents that to salute the flag was sacrilege against God, it is not difficult to foresee the day when public opinion will demand that the child be protected against parents whose treatment results in a crippled or warped personality.

These violent acts of the law, this ruthless tearing apart of flesh and blood were committed by courts in the interests of maintaining the status quo. They are beautiful examples of what the state thinks it must do when its primary concern is preserving certain forms of religion and patriotism. Let us suppose a different goal, happiness and wellbeing of individuals; then human relationships would count most. Children would not be separated from parents who violated traditional moralities: they would be severed from parents who violated the right of the child to sanity and integrity of mind and body.

Numerous social resources have restricted the field of parental activity.

In the meantime while we are waiting for the spread of knowledge that will emphasize the impor-

[3] This boy was committed to the state training school, then when the authorities of that institution refused to keep him because he was not "delinquent," he was ordered placed for adoption.

tance and sacredness of childhood, the modern parent must achieve an outlook which makes it possible for him to accept necessary restrictions placed by the state upon parental power.

The community has expressed its concern for childhood by creating institutions. It is increasingly common for births to take place in hospitals, infant feeding has become an esoteric rite few parents would attempt without expert assistance; when children are ill, they are cared for by specialists far better equipped than parents. Nursery schools know more about healthful habit-formation, and training in normal emotional expression, than the majority of parents; at six or so the child must be turned over to the school or face the compulsory education law; to what he shall learn there the parent must submit, though he disbelieves every word of it; the average child must be sent to the church for religious instruction, or the parents will be considered immoral or freakish; the home no longer is expected to provide work, or recreation. Adventure must be sought in summer camps; team-play will be learned in clubs, playgrounds, or Boy Scout troops. Books, handicraft, music, pictures, general "culture" will be gained, if at all, through libraries, museums, forums, and settlements.

If the child becomes unmanageable, the parent will seek the boarding or military school, or turn to the juvenile court.

At every stage in the child's life some modern organized agency will say to the parent: "We can do this better than you can." The family is none the worse for these modern devices, not one of which, nor all together, could rear a normal child, without the aid of parents.

The parent must learn to use and to evaluate social resources.

Social resources are but other names for the extension of our homes. We should use them without being engulfed by them. Some parents appear to acquiesce hopelessly in this new kind of outside interference. They may feel when the child returns from fresh exposure to some social agency interested in his education or reform, that Jean Paul was right when he said: "I am afraid of every adult,—hairy hand and fist, that paws in among this tender pollen of child-flowers, shaking off here one color, there another, so as to produce the right variegated carnation."

But the parent need not play a passive rôle, indeed he cannot. He is always expressing approval or disapproval. By these means he determines his child's intake. He becomes the child's mapmaker. Parents often show an attitude like jealousy when children begin to live more vitally away from home than in it.[4] This is because they themselves are not clear as to what they want for their children. The important thing is that the child should lead a full life. The parent may be afraid that the child will become infatuated with the adults who run the schools, clubs, camps and neighborhood groups. Infatuation with outside adults is a sign that the child is needy. Something is lacking in the education of his affections. Shutting him up at home with unlovable relatives will not cure him. No sturdy parent who uses reasonable care to make himself attractive need fear competition in the love-interest of the

[4] *See* discussion of the vital-interest groups, neighborhood, school, play, work, et cetera, in Lindeman, Eduard: "The Community." Association Press, p. 26.

young child. But this is not the point. The parent should be more interested in his child's growth than in his response; therefore, approval should be given to the experiences which are upbuilding, and disapproval should be expressed for those which are wasteful and disintegrating. This forces the parent to become a judge of values. In the midst of a variety of social resources he must use discrimination.

Families show great differences in capacity to use social resources. Certain families in poor neighborhoods seek out all the facilities. The parents make use of everything, they send the youngest child to the Nursery School, a gifted boy to the music settlement; his sister joins a nature-study club, all the family goes on excursions to the Art Museum, the mother learns millinery at the night school, the father learns to repair the automobile. That the home is poor and overcrowded, does not matter. It is full of interested individuals on the up-grade.

Other families may exist in neat monotonous homes in "good" neighborhoods, free from poverty and crime, and the lives they lead may be as dull as ditch-water.

To use social resources constructively the parent must make his contribution to them. Bridges and roads can safely be left to experts but not institutions dealing with human life. A man cannot ignore the things that happen to human beings in schools, churches, courts, workshops and city streets and love his wife and children adequately.

This is the reason why we have had so much child welfare with such scant results. The problems of social institutions are parents' problems. Many parents already know this and have met together as

parents.[5] The new way is better than the old isolation.

The major problem of the parent, the one above all others peculiar to him is his opportunity to interpret the changing world to the child. That he must do this indirectly is all the greater challenge. In spite of seeming change the tasks of human beings remain the same: food-getting, shelter, clothing, love, finding a mate, family formation, birth, growth, illness, death, fighting, accumulating and safeguarding the little possessions that seem to make life worth while, exploring, manipulating, building, creating, learning skill, getting along with other human beings, and finding something to worship. There are innumerable ways of accomplishing these purposes. While the child should have confidence that his parents have a secure hold they should not make him feel that other solutions are impossible or wholly unworthy.

For all the changes in human relationships which really matter we have paid tremendous prices. Wars, epidemics, earthquakes, fires, revolutions, emigrations, industrial upheavals have been followed by social changes which although they wiped out the "margin of safety" for countless people, were not only necessary to continued existence but wholesome. To-day a new social order is being brought about bloodlessly. Youth is bearing most of the burden. As our knowledge accumulates we see that life may be lived in a variety of ways without shipwreck. The parent should possess the requisite serenity and sophistication to furnish a guiding-line to the child without destroying his virility.

[5] Groups of parents now organize their own Nursery Schools, progressive schools, summer camps, et cetera.

The parent must learn to thread his way through a maze of scientific theories and religious dogmas.

Most of the really terrible things done to children are the result of devotion to theory, or doctrine. Whereas we are prone to blame vice or indifference, it is more often false science, philosophy or religion.

The status of the child in the New England family in Colonial times hung upon the theory of infant damnation. Childhood was distorted and incredibly precocious because conversion must come at the earliest possible moment. Cotton Mather writes: "I took my little daughter Katy (aged four) into my study and there told my child that I am to dy shortly and she must, when I am dead, remember everything I now said unto her. I sett before her the sinfull condition of her nature and charged her to pray in secret places every day. That God for the sake of Jesus Christ would give her a new heart. . . . I gave her to understand that when I am taken from her she must look to meet with more humbling afflictions than she does now she has a tender father to provide for her."

This was thirty years before he died.[6]

It is easier to smile at ancient error than to find courage to declare some modern scientific dogmas ridiculous.

Some schools of modern thought lead parents into making wrong analogies. Supported by what they believe to be "psychology," they behave toward the young child as if he were an animal to be trained solely by pleasure-pain methods, or a savage to be

[6] "Concerning Parental Attitudes." Child Study. Published by Child Study Association of America. New York, 1927. *See also* "Mental Hygiene," Vol. VIII, No. 3.

controlled by the taboo, or a "small adult" to be governed by adult moralities and penalties. Dr. Bernard Glueck has written a suggestive little article warning parents against the dangers of following "science" blindly.[7]

The doctrine of heredity is another stumbling block to parents. They observe the amazing tenacity of whim in a baby, the radical differences between children in the same family, and they conclude that although the design may be somewhat worn by handling it was stamped on the coin from the beginning. Hence it is easy for parents to become fatalists. For them eugenics is the new Calvinism. It is also the least troublesome way out, for it furnishes excuses for the bad behavior of children and places the blame upon undesirable relatives. No trained mind can overlook the importance of heredity. But there is very little genuine knowledge of the rôle it plays in human life. No first-rate biologist is ready to say we inherit gloom, selfishness, temper, avarice, or stubbornness, although certain writers in eugenics tell us so. There is no clear evidence that insanity is inherited; in fact recent studies of the families of the insane tend to show it is not. Nothing is gained by minimizing either heredity or environment. The parent must inform himself that there are two schools of thought and each bases its teachings upon interpretations and convictions, rather than a strict reading of the facts. The parent need not choose between belief in hered-

[7] Calhoun, Arthur W., Ph.D.: "A Social History of the American Family from Colonial Times to the Present," in 3 vols. Arthur H. Clark Co., Cleveland, Ohio, 1917-1919, Vol. I, p. 108.

ity or environment. His own experience teaches him that behavior can be modified. Parental contagion is the true explanation of many good and bad so-called traits.

We have not succeeded in defining what the original equipment is. Use of equipment is a factor of supreme importance and there is much evidence that this is a phenomenon of learning. Watson and others have shown how much is due to the conditioned replex built up in infancy and early childhood.[8]

Studies of the transformation of young children in habit clinics, studies of treatment of delinquents show overwhelmingly that human beings can be changed by the acts and attitudes of other human beings. That some individuals do not respond proves nothing, although it may indicate that our methods of reëducation are faulty or begun too late. No one who is familiar with the work of penologists like Kirchwey or with the outcome of modern probation[9] can be content with a complacent, uncritical acceptance of the doctrine of heredity.

So much alarming popular literature has been written about defective children that a diagnosis of defect, or serious handicap, like epilepsy or neurotic constitution, freezes the parent into despair. To parents who have heard such a "sentence" pronounced upon their child we can now say confidently that wise educational methods, coupled with a parental attitude of serenity and affection, will often

[8] Watson, John, Ph.D.: "Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist."

[9] Cooley, Edwin: "Probation and Delinquency." Published by the Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York, 1927.

turn an original organic weakness into an asset. Great talent in music, art, poetry, science and religion have so frequently been found in persons afflicted with bad eyesight, deafness, epilepsy, and nervous and mental disorders, that some scientists have indicated that genius flows from tainted streams of inheritance. Rosanoff has suggested that normality and mediocrity are synonymous.[10] Certainly if we eliminated all the contributions made by individuals suffering from physical or mental handicaps the world would be badly off. Probably, as we learn more, we shall discover that inherited disease has less to do with ability than we think; it may be that the extraordinary effort put forth produces those "organic tensions" which result in achievement. To "win over difficulties" [11] is the important thing.

Most parents prefer a child who is like their idea of other children. When they begin to suspect that their child is different, they feel the blow intolerable. They try to force the child to do things so antagonistic to his nature that they are likely to destroy him. The child may know his own needs best.

A boy of fourteen had a mother with unusual gifts for leadership. She organized community movements, had distinctive social charm. Her son could not bear to go anywhere alone, not even to symphony concerts which were his main interest. He was two years accelerated in school. He spent his time reading, cataloging famous pictures, listening to music on his phonograph, locking his door and directing his invisible orchestra. He was cour-

[10] Rosanoff, Aaron J.: "Manual of Psychiatry," 6th edition, pp. 338-340. John Wiley & Sons. New York, 1927.

[11] Adler, Alfred, M.D.: "Character and Talent." *Harper's Magazine*. New York, June, 1927. A remarkable article which should be read by every parent and teacher.

teous, aloof, methodical, exceedingly tenacious; at home he was no problem, unless his routine was interfered with; then he became irritable. Naturally his vivacious, splendid mother would have preferred to see him riding horseback, driving cars, taking girls to dances. At first she tried to make him do these things, but the boy had a will as strong as hers and he successfully managed his life in harmony with its deepest needs. For this boy had a serious nervous illness. He needed exactly the systematic, protected, busy routine he had laid down for himself. To-day this mother has become aware of his marked esthetic gifts. She supports him with all her courage and love, though the diagnosis of his difficulty nearly swamped her. A different kind of mother might not only have wrecked his career as music conductor, or critic, but destroyed the valuable assets of his personality.

Not all mothers have such courage-demanding situations to face, but most parents will discover that they largely create their problems by treatment or attitudes derived from their own ideas, instead of patient observation of the child himself.

From the scientific study of childhood the parent may rely safely upon two things, first that the individual life-story of the child is a *scientific* fact, second, that there are "many kinds of normality."

If a parent wishes to be "scientific" in the rearing of a child his problem is to secure sufficient technique to record child behavior and chronological history accurately. Old letters, records, diaries, give a great deal of data useful in charting heredity. In addition the parent should learn how to draw up a list of the child's assets and liabilities, how to interpret first illnesses, headaches, food-aversions, night-ter-

rors and the like. Adolf Meyer has given us an invaluable method for recording graphically the important events in the personality history.[12]

The value of the individual study of the child outweighs in importance any other scientific concept which the parent can gain. At definite points of difficulty the parent must seek guidance from wise specialists, and he must know how to avoid the unwise.

That normality embraces many degrees of strength and weakness, and a great variety of types, is the conclusion we come to after much experience with so-called problem children. The parent should not be dismayed at unusual or unpleasant behavior. Standards of normality are hard to arrive at and the parent should be trained to accept and to provide for a wide diversity.

The parent must know the "world of a child." [13]

That the child is a distinct being from an adult is the basic law of the scientific study of childhood, a discovery that eventually will change our human world as fundamentally as the discoveries of Copernicus. That his conduct must not be judged by adult standards is a corollary which civilization must learn or perish. A few of our schools, and Juvenile Courts have grasped it, but most of the adult world ignores it, with the result that we destroy millions of children annually. Here our rigid con-

[12] Meyer, Adolf, M.D.: "Mental and Moral Health in a Constructive School Program: Suggestions of Modern Science Concerning Education." Macmillan Co., New York, 118, pp. 106-111.

[13] Koffka, Kurt: "The Growth of the Mind, an Introduction to Child Psychology." Translated by Robert Morris Ogden. Harcourt, Brace and Co. New York, 1925. Chapter VI, pp. 336-356.

cepts of morality, our notions of crime and punishment do their deadliest work.

Any relief must come from the home. If parents treat their children as children, no other adults will dare do otherwise.

Understanding of the child's world cannot be gained from reading, nor from observation, or memory. It must be creatively reconstructed by an intricate process which uses science, imagination and experience, the process Christ described as being "reborn." In moments of insight and exaltation we glimpse this state; Masefield has recently spoken of it in a simple way which can be understood by everybody.[14]

We learn from Koffka that "the fixed and rigid connections that pervade our world are but a result of the domination of our non-play life; whereas to a child this domination is not originally present, and only gradually introduces itself." [15] "A child's ability to bring the present into relation with the past and the future is quite inadequate." The important features of our world are non-existent for the child. The world that he lives in is unfamiliar to us.

The average adult cannot even grasp the difference between toys. Ann's dolls were all in bed. "Douglas is three; he sleeps with me. David and Richard are twins about three and a half. Billy is just a baby, he sleeps in his crib."

"And this little girl doll, who is she?"

"Oh," said Ann, "that's just a plaything of Billy's."

"Don't you love it enough to give it a name?"

[14] Masefield, John: "Shakespeare and the Spiritual Life." Romanes' Lecture: Oxford.

[15] Koffka, p. 346.

"Billy can name it, if he wants to," said Ann indifferently.

The problem of gaining the respect of the child. Every parent starts out with a lavish capital and gradually squanders it. The child adores him in the truest meaning of the word; he has the whole matter of respect in his hands, so to speak. The child gains his idea of God from what he believes his parent to be.[16] But every infant in his cradle anticipates a discovery of mental hygiene, that human conduct can be modified. His screams, smiles, and beguilements bring about results not planned by parents. As the child grows older he exploits the childishness of adults, and soon learns that, although they are more powerful physically, they respond in an infantile way to infantile demonstrations. The spectacle of the mother of a three-year-old son, returning blow for blow; the wheedling, petting, scolding, bribing, and threatening activities of parents, slowly destroy the child's respect. In this predicament parents formerly called upon divine authority. Now they must rely on their own resources. "To let the child alone and to set him a good example," [17] is the almost impossible advice of one of the wisest of our educators. When parents learn that "respect" must be won, that it is not an intrinsic possession, following on the mere fact of parenthood, they will turn their efforts to an analysis of their own behavior.

It is noteworthy that children with courteous manners and habits of consideration for others have

[16] Bovet, Pierre, Director of Rousseau Institute for Child Study, Geneva, Switzerland, "Le Sentiment Religieux et la Psychologie de l'Enfant."

[17] Burnham, William, Ph.D.: "The Normal Mind." Clark University.

learned these responses without difficulty from courteous, considerate parents.

The young son of a man who loved ships risked his life to save an old rowboat adrift from his yacht.[18]

Similarly most of the evil, daring, or beautiful acts to which we seem impelled are due to reverberations from childhood, the origins of which escape us, but which may be traced to our sympathy, or antipathy to parental behavior.

The problem of security.

A father who is a very successful business man and wished to provide his infant son with the best care available in the modern world, consulted a famous psychiatrist. He chose him as he would a civil engineer, by his reputation among his own kind for reliable work. He said:

"Doctor, I come merely for advice. My boy is well. I want to keep him well. Tell me how to train him. What are the principles of child care that you doctors are agreed on? I shall follow them scrupulously."

"And, do you know," said the father afterward to one of his friends, "all that fellow could tell me could be put in a nut-shell. He said: 'Keep the child tranquil—tranquillity in the relationship of the parents is the great thing. The child must feel security.' I had supposed psychiatry had something to it."

This meeting between a rich father, saturated with the modern idea that science can solve all problems, if one but follows the rules; that the good life is purchasable,—and the physician who summed up in his own person the accumulated wisdom of all

[18] Banning, Hugh: "In Mexican Waters."

searches for truth,—dramatizes for us the situation. Health and happiness are not purchasable, although little scientists appear to offer them for sale.

If we can give our child the *feeling of security* we have given him the best foundation available.

How do it? Let the parent ask himself what makes *him* feel secure. He must have love. He must feel wanted; that nothing is too much trouble for his comfort. His material surroundings must be stable, his place established among his fellow beings. There must be a bed-rock against the sides of which his energy may flow and beat. The adult probably can never know security in this sense unless he be a great lover, or a mystic. He will find a substitute in work. The young child, however, can easily attain security by resting against his parents; animals with their beautiful devotion to offspring may help us to recapture for human children the security we seem to have lost in civilization. All delinquent children lack it; the one generalization we can make about the life-stories of delinquents is that they have been subjected to insecurity, frequent upheavals, indifference, quarrels, harshness, strains in early childhood. They have witnessed adults in strife. Mexican children frequently possess security. Indian children do, and often peasants. That it may appear hand in hand with civilization and the sternest demands for hard labor and social obedience we learn from Japanese families.[19]

Perhaps we may sum it up best by saying that, for modern culture, it consists of steady parental love and interest, courtesy that never fails between parents, and parents and children, adequate attention to

[19] Sugimota, Etsu Magaki: "A Daughter of the Samurai." Doubleday, Page. New York, 1927.

physical comfort in early years, meeting the child's expectations with stability, an utter frankness of speech, refusal to be shocked, a parental faith in the integrity of life.

The problem of weaning.

Weaning, that is to say, teaching the child to do without his parents, must begin at birth. There is no sudden emancipation possible. Children must learn to accept solitude, pain, and defeat very early. Babies of the pioneer mother and the working mother are fortunate. Unless parents in "easy circumstances" learn to withdraw support gradually, their children will react violently to freedom. When the young child is deprived of the companionship of his mother too abruptly he resorts to thumb-sucking and masturbation; the older child loses himself in day-dreams or useless activity. Weaning and security must grow on the same stem, and be seen together as goals in every parental act. From the beginning the parent should stimulate the child's interest in the outside world.

The problem of sex.

Happily for children, the younger generation of parents seem to be making a great advance in the solution of their own sex problems. For, as Jessie Taft has pointed out with consummate skill:[20] "the mere fact that sex has its beginning in childhood, like all other human needs, would not of itself con-

[20] Taft, Jessie, Ph.D.: "Sex in Children: The World Tomorrow." Reprinted by the American Association of University Women. This little article is indispensable. Every parent should read it.

stitute a special problem were it not for the lack of sex adjustment and understanding in grown-ups."

In this brief space the present writer wishes merely to stress the conviction that no "sex-instruction" can be wholesome or adequate that is not imparted by parents to children in infancy and childhood. The anguish, hatred of life, weariness, that "restlessness of mind than which man can suffer nothing worse while he is alive," which are the results of the parents' failure to deal honestly with the child in matters of sex, cannot be over-emphasized.

"The parent who would keep his child really pure and undefiled will have to look upon the natural first interests of childhood with an uncontaminated eye. He will have to drop off his own evil associations with honest functions and learn to appreciate what nursing and urination and defecation mean in the life of an infant whose chief activities they are. To force upon the baby a moral attitude toward his primary satisfactions and most important sources of contact with the world seems hardly necessary even for his future salvation and our present comfort." [21]

Long before the child begins to "ask questions," far earlier than school entrance, he should know the father's part in reproduction, as well as the mother's, and should be told that sexual intercourse is an act of affection.[22]

One cannot find a sadder thing to say than that parents formerly believed they had to conceal this knowledge from children to avoid indecency.

[21] Jessie Taft.
[22] Hamilton, Gilbert, M.D.

The problem of work.

The finding of a task is the key-note to that integration of personality which is the goal of mental hygiene.[23] The child has no difficulty with this problem, save through parental interference, and discontent. As early as 1346, some one noted "the unhappiness of those who are engaged in other people's affairs"; since professional reformers were then undiscovered we do not know whom he meant. Adults who are worthily employed are not likely to interfere with a child's spontaneous pursuits; hence they become the best parents.

In addition to the duty of non-interference, the parent has a positive function, that of initiating his child into the delights of sustained activity. Formerly men had grasped the significance of work more surely than women. The futility of the lives of many middle-aged modern women [24] is doubtless due to absence of a sound work-tradition in the rearing of a female child, a generation ago.

John Dewey has said that he would be willing to have the student forget all the informational data of his college course if he could substitute for this a consuming interest in something.

For parents to provide this it is necessary for them to seek to preserve the child's energy: "Waste no free energy," is an important law of education.[25]

[23] Burnham, William, Ph.D.: "The Normal Mind." Macmillan. New York.

[24] These Modern Women, Series in *The Nation*. *See also* "Comments," by Hinckle, Watson and Joseph Collins, *The Nation*, July 6, 1927.

[25] Adolf Meyer: quoting: Ostwald's "Imperative of Energetics."

The problem of guidance.

In relinquishing their children to experts, many parents seem to have forgotten that children are still as much in need of parental guidance as ever. A mother of a fourteen-year-old girl writes: "I know I am not in touch with this generation and its ways," and adds: "I hope you will be able to make a human being out of Rose. I can't because I have to work to feed and clothe and shelter her," which expresses the sentiment of many mothers and fathers to-day. No parent can safely permit the school, church, clinic, or court to allocate to themselves the supplying of a life-goal. That many children are wiser than their parents is no reason that a child can do without a wise parent. Many children turn spontaneously toward what is wholesome and rewarding, others are like the little boy who visited the museum. He was fascinated and bewildered with the variety, bestowing on kettledrums, mummies, weapons, and models of ships an equal amount of attention. Finally he said firmly to his adult friend:

"You must take me where I ought to go, or I shall miss something I ought to see."

So to-day the child, particularly the adolescent, turns with the old challenge, uttered with a new skepticism to the adult:

"Can you take me where I ought to go?"

The parental function in a changing world has changed only apparently. Stimulation, training, discipline, authority, wisdom, are still needed. The difference is that parents can no longer rely on instinct, or affection or tradition. They must know, themselves, "where they are going."

The problem of shared responsibility.

Study of normal children who become leaders [26] indicates that the child who is permitted to carry responsibility at home easily excels others.

It is difficult for parents in homes with the "latest conveniences" to accomplish this. The child is likely to break the electric washing machine, the vacuum cleaner, the "automatic" heater, refrigerator, etc. But the child must not only learn to manipulate these devices, but must share in the whole business of living together. Some parents possess sufficient imagination to provide this naturally. Others must learn the technique.

The problem of prestige.

How to develop taste, that "esthetic aversion" which Rosanoff has indicated is our surest moral guide, is a tremendous problem for parents. Intolerance, snobbery, priggishness, aloofness, lack of virility, are often the by-products of family training which in its attempts to inculcate a family pride has succeeded only in spoiling the child for life in a democracy. How shall a child trained by fastidious parents and censorious brothers and sisters avoid shipwreck when he meets, as he surely must, "the troubles and afflictions of a populous environment."

"Do not play with those children: they are common." "Do not laugh aloud: it is vulgar." Gradually the child builds up an insecure feeling of superiority which robs him of the sense of ease when he meets unexpected behavior in others. A vigorous, whimsical or grotesque personality disgusts him. He has the attitude of being strangely worried

[26] *See* Chapter VIII.

as if he were saying: "I am living in this generation, yet I would rather have been born in any other." [27]

The sense of belonging to a sturdy family background is one of the most priceless social inheritances a child can know. Surely parents can furnish this to the child without depriving him of the vastly more important feeling of belonging to mankind.

The problem of privacy.

Parents who have allowed themselves no privacy cannot be expected to value it for their children. Privacy, however, is as necessary as sunlight for growing children. Yoemans, author of *Shackled Youth,* has pointed out that nothing is more needed in our times than opportunity for being alone.[28] There are two kinds of a good time, the fun one has in comradeship,—and the joy one experiences in solitude. It is a sin of modern architecture that each member of the family is audible and visible to all the others, every hour of the day. If homes cannot supply privacy children must be sent away to seek it.

Privacy is not so much a physical thing as an acquisition that can be created. A child, however, is helpless; he cannot, unaided, discover the old device of philosophers, and poets. He cannot put wool into his ears, like Tennyson at a reception, nor say with Petrarch, "But when some need compels me to dwell in the city, I have learned to create a solitude among people and a haven of refuge in the midst of a tempest, using a device, not generally known, of so controlling the senses that they do not perceive what they perceive." The child can know

[27] Petrarch: "Life of Solitude," p. 176.
[28] Yeomans, Edward: "Modern Parenthood." Los Angeles. March, 1927.

privacy only if the parents are courteous, and sensitive to his needs.

An adolescent boy wrote in his diary: "Security at home! One's own desk! What luxury! No violations: one's letters may lie about in carelessness. An eye so keen that it elects what to pass over."

The lad who could write thus was remarkably fortunate in his parents. He had known a certain delicate chivalry that is all too rare.

Of what are parents afraid when they invade the sanctity of their children's rooms? Do they think something will go on there they ought to know? Of what value are the thoughts, reveries and treasured hoardings of scraps of paper that children find so dear? Only that they may be shared, only that they may be imparted later to some one worthy of complete confidence.

Why not to parents? Only because parents have sometimes forfeited the right by their disregard of privacy.

A visible grace and courage surrounds the individual whose parents have solved this problem.

CHAPTER IV

NINETEEN WAYS OF BEING A BAD PARENT

As we learn more about human behavior we become less interested in the formulation of concepts such as *causes, good, bad, disease, normal,* etc. We learn to be specific. The unique quality of each individual personality, the unprecedented nature of each situation impress themselves upon us. When we glimpse the truth it seems incredible. We are frightened and bewildered at so much variety. If each situation in family life is unique, a dynamic meeting in a particular time and space of personalities and environment and social inheritances in a way unheard of before and impossible to repeat, if each situation has its own laws which must be interpreted with sensitive regard for the human eccentricities of all concerned, then parenthood becomes an exacting art. It cannot be mastered by merely following the rules. We shall have to develop an intense curiosity which makes us responsive to all that is going on at the moment. Does a child deliberately upset the cream jug: what shall we do? There is no categorical answer. It may depend on the weather, the state of the child's nerves, whether his father is rushing to catch a train.

That the parent-child relationship presents fundamental difficulties is evident from the fact that no philosophy of life or education insures a parent against making blunders. All sorts of people have trouble with their children. Quakers, Jews, Catho-

lics, Protestants, Christian Scientists, Freethinkers, Fundamentalists, scientists, psychiatrists, artists and social workers have submitted themselves to certain disciplines which logically lead to certain attitudes toward human relationships, yet their children are often found miserably unhappy, insecure and without guidance. Ironically we observe that labor leaders, emancipators, champions of free speech and liberty are as likely as not dominant, possessive or tyrannical parents. Methodists and Republicans, or other "conservatives" may apply the doctrine of extreme self-determination in the rearing of their children.

There are more than nineteen ways of being a bad parent. Still we can detect certain habit-patterns of bad parental behavior; certain blunders tend to be constantly reflected. Some of these show up more clearly in Juvenile Court than elsewhere; many are found in every good neighborhood.

The following cases may be used as illustrations:

A parent may be good while the children are young, yet become a bad parent when the children are older.

The Newton home was unusually attractive. There was an old garden. When Jane, aged nine, heard people singing "Way Down Upon the Suwanee River" she said: "That is the way I feel about my home: 'all up and down the old plantation, sadly I roam.'" But Jane did not roam sadly, except when she saw the subdividers greedily encroaching upon the surrounding orchards, and felt the place might be sold. Jane was one of the happiest and most fortunate children on earth. She glowed with health. Since babyhood she had had special feeding, regular

hours, long sleep in an airy nursery, books, pictures, a pony, joyous rambles with her father and mother, a tool chest, a place to keep her own things, a richly colored, imaginative childhood, a share in household tasks. She could cook, sew, lay a table, swim, and dance. Her lithe body with its smooth skin was exquisitely cared for.

There were four older children. Fred was twelve. His life flowed in the same pleasant channels as Jane's. A boy of sixteen was in boarding school. Isabel was eighteen, and Richard twenty-two. Their mother was a woman of abundant vitality. She supervised everything in her house and neighborhood. She used to say: "When my last child is through college I am going to take up social work." It seems harsh to call her a bad parent. Yet recently things have not been going well in her household. When Richard returns from college he is restless, aloof and moody. His mother criticizes everything he says, wears and does. She demands the same little services and obediences of him that she expects of Jane. The conversation is chiefly about family events, the celebration of birthdays and festivals, the domestic routine, pets, dinners, personal traits of relatives, sayings and doings of the children. The father is a sensitive and delightful man. He gives much time to his family, but nothing of his interesting and important work comes home with him. Both parents have succeeded in creating an atmosphere stimulating to young children, but flat for the older ones.

Mrs. Newton would be the last mother to admit that she did not wish her children to grow up. Yet there is evidence that this is so. All the illnesses of the children are exaggerated tremendously. When

Richard broke his arm she insisted on his doing nothing for a whole summer. She will never let Isabel go anywhere alone, she refuses to take her to clubs and meetings, although Isabel wishes to go and has shown already the same capacity for domineering leadership that her mother has. Isabel's most unobserving friends have noticed that Mrs. Newton shuts the door and pulls down the curtains whenever her daughter's interest is aroused in the outside world. Isabel is talented; her life thus restricted has become concentrated intensely. She is a shrewd and narrow critic, prim and over-conscientious. She nags her brothers and sister. She is censorious and dictatorial. It is difficult to see how she is going to adjust to adult life. Mrs. Newton is quite blind to this phase of her motherhood. She says: "There is nothing new to read about child care. I wish some one would help me with my children," but in reality she is unaware of any problems.

In the home sits the older Mrs. Newton, the father's mother. She is proud of her son. She watches every move of the grandchildren, and although she does not interfere she upholds a silent powerful influence, an ideal standard of what a Newton grandchild ought to be. It is this invisible government which weighs so heavily on the mother. She knows she knows how to care for young children. Unconsciously she is always turning the clock back so the hour will not strike when she will have to deal with something unfamiliar, a challenging household of young Americans. Isabel's last party dress was a dotted muslin with blue sash. Jane would have looked better in it. Mrs. Newton would still prefer to have Richard wear Eton collars.

It is only because in this home there are such un-

reached possibilities for growth and happiness that we call Mrs. Newton one of the bad parents. Something has fallen across the stream, retarding it at a lovely spot. But the children must pass by. There will be unnecessary suffering and a struggle.

A parent is bad if he is not orientated in the modern world.

William was fourteen, very tall and awkward, an only child. His father taught chemistry in a little college, and his mother, who had been a trained nurse, worked in a doctor's office. Both parents were in early middle age when they married; for this reason William had a lonely childhood; his parents' interests and habits had become stabilized. They judged everything that William did by adult standards of conduct. When he was six he took a dime from his mother's purse and was reprimanded with as much solemnity as if he had been in police court. He had few possessions and no spending money. At nine years of age he emptied a teacup full of money from the pantry shelf into his pocket and spent it for candy and a pair of roller skates. His mother had been saving it to buy him a suit. He was whipped, first by his mother, then by his father. After this William stole regularly a dollar or so every month but no one discovered it. One evening his parents gave a dinner party. William crept upstairs and took $5.00 from one of the coats laid out on the bed. The owner happened to be a rather kindly relative and made light of it, although William was confronted by his father in the presence of two guests. William was thrashed cruelly. The father was glad when the mother interceded for he was sick at heart. He felt such utter humiliation.

The son of a college professor, *his* son a thief. The idea was so alien to his scheme of life, he had never heard of it occurring before in *his* kind of family, or in his social class. He explained this as well as he could to William. William was thirteen and the father used arguments and illustrations valid for a prosperous middle-age. William understood only one thing clearly: next time it happened he would be sent away to jail. He took in nothing of his father's grief and anxiety. He appeared stolid and remorseless.

This was in August. In September he entered high school. He had no brilliant jazz-sweater like the other boys, no running pants for the gym, no spending money for anything. For three weeks his father had not spoken to him, even in blame; he hardly looked in his direction; his mother did not notice the holes in his socks, but then she never had. It was the football season, and William wanted a leather helmet. One day he was poking around the locker rooms, and found himself on the girls' side. He felt excited and foolish. A door was ajar. William pushed aside an absurd green silk blouse, opened a vanity case and took three dollar bills. The janitor caught him. Open-mouthed and sheepish William "confessed" at once in an impromptu hearing before the principal, the vice-principal, the girls' gym teacher, the boys' gym teacher, two filing clerks and the registrar.[1]

[1] Incalculable damage is often done in schools by the unwise handling of behavior problems. We may expect parents to be backward in accepting scientific methods, but surely educational institutions ought to know enough to entrust the most delicate of human adjustments, those which involve delinquency among children, to their own experts. Unfortunately, the schools, as often as the parents, use obsolete police methods.

In this case the verdict was influenced by the fact that the father was a teacher. "He comes of such a good family, we will send him home." William showed such panic that his teacher went with him. She waited until seven in the evening, sitting in the forlorn atmosphere of an empty house, when it is supper-time and even the table is not laid.

William's father very calmly went to the telephone and called the police. The little college town was antiquated in all its ways; William lay two weeks in jail before his hearing in the Juvenile Court. The judge heard the case carefully, then said privately to the father: "Sometimes youngsters steal and get over it when they have had a good lesson. We will send him home."

"Not to my home," said the father. "I wash my hands of him."

However, the judge did send William home. He placed him under the supervision of Mr. Collins, a kindly bachelor on the Board of Education, who had a knack with children. Thereafter William went to the City Hall every day after school. He sat on the edge of his chair, looking miserable, waiting until Mr. Collins had opened his mail.

Soon he was talking with an eager light in his eyes that no one had seen there before:

"Well, how are you?"

"I'm pretty well."

"Got a job yet?"

"No. I've looked everywhere."

Mr. Collins got him a job as messenger and William rushed about town like a young airedale. After six weeks, Mr. Collins missed fifteen dollars from his desk. Without accusation William admitted at once that he had taken it. Unfortunately the money

was spent, for shows, a book on electrical engineering, innumerable ice-cream sodas, a fountain pen, and a pair of gym shoes. Mr. Collins sent him home, but his employer heard of it and he lost his job. For a week William did not come. After school he sat in the silent house and brooded. One day he reappeared. It was February.

"See here, William, you need a new suit of clothes."

"I know it," said William dully.

"Well, I'll stand you to some clothes. You can pay me back $2.50 a week. Then there is that $15.00. It will take you to vacation time."

William left the store with an outfit new from the skin out. He found himself a job. He was happier than he had been before in his life, but at home he lived as an invisible lodger. His parents behaved as if they acted on the theory that he did not exist.

In June he burst into Mr. Collins' office after running all the way from home:

"Mr. Collins, I think—I am not sure—but I think to-night as he was going out the door my father smiled at me." This was eighteen months ago. William is now a steady young fellow with an average school record. He has not stolen again.

What has happened here? We do not know. Without the help of what we call scientific adjustment William has checked a long habit of disregard for property. Has he merely acquired new habits, thereby "outgrowing" the old, or has the interest of his adult friend satisfied his longing for affection, and given him something to live for? There is no telling.

But from many points of view we feel that the college professor made a bad parent. Leaving out

of account William's drab home life, the absorption of his parents in their adult pursuits, their failure to give him spending money, or to clothe him so that he felt equal to other boys, we face the fact that his father lacked orientation in the modern world. As a chemist he should have known something of the laws of cause and effect. As a scientist he should have known that science has something to say when a child steals. He did not appeal to force, lose his temper, call in the police when a refractory element in his laboratory went wrong, but in the case of his only son he reacted blindly and violently, partly because of chagrin and pride, partly because he was densely ignorant of progress in the science of human behavior. He repudiated William when he clashed with the accepted standards of his class and position. He did not seek guidance, he failed to apply his concepts of natural law, cause and effect, he was baffled by a problem that was not intrinsically difficult, but was exaggerated by his emotions and fear. He could not even smile, until he felt sure the problem was solved. In short this parent in his laboratory lived in the twentieth century, and in his home in the days of savagery and tribal magic when ordering and forbidding [2] were relied upon to change human behavior.

A parent who makes a faulty characterization of a child is bad.

It is impossible to deal with human beings without characterizing them. We say they are shy, cruel, frank, selfish, evasive, happy-go-lucky, unfeeling, good or bad. These are names for the effects per-

[2] Thomas, W. I.: "Introduction to the Polish Peasant," Vol. I, p. 89.

sons produce on us. Having labeled them, we interpret their subsequent behavior in terms of our own emotional reactions. Accurate observation of personality requires a special sensitivity, long training in objective thinking, self-control, imagination and a rich background of human experience. The average person is no more qualified to describe a child than he is to make deep-sea soundings. Yet in this field we all think we are experts. In other scientific matters our errors produce no bad results on the objects observed. Animals are not injured by the stupidities of those who run them through mazes and think they understand the mysteries of their lives; the star and the protoplasm suffer no change by being wrongly classified. But human beings respond to human speech and opinion in a way which alters their very tissue.

Let a person say: "There is not much to Ethel," "Louise is stubborn," "John is exactly like his father," and subtle changes set in in the personality. There is doubtless some truth in the original trenchant observations of parents. As Koffka has pointed out, the parent is in the most favorable position for scientific observation. The difficulty is that he may misinterpret what he sees, or he does not see enough. In court a mother will maintain that her daughter is entirely without feeling. "Nothing that I say has the slightest effect. She has no sense of remorse." The mother has missed the mute eloquence of the body, the lip that quivered before it set, the throat that was swollen before it tightened. If she expected speech, or sobs, she is disappointed, and to her, "Jane is now and always has been phlegmatic."

The secret of some sudden "cures" of children

whose conduct has been a problem to parents often lies in their meeting with a person who sees behind the screen built up of defenses and responses to adult expectations. Such a person may see at once that the shy child is not "a little mouse," as she was characterized by an incredibly stupid aunt, but a child whose personality will develop a silent strength and integrity upon which hundreds of human beings will rest their troubles. It was not *timidity* that kept this child quiet, but thoughts. How could she fail to see that her aunt was a fool?

It is usual to-day, on noting the hard brilliance of boys and girls, their nonchalance, indifference, skill in repartee, apparent capacity to do without love, or adult approval, to call them *sophisticated.* In order to understand what has happened to adolescents to make them hard, at a period of life when we know they are most sensitive to criticism, we must study the situation in which the hardness first arose. Jack Black expresses it with extraordinary insight when he describes the horror of his first night in jail. He had gone to deliver some milk in a house that was raided. The police gathered him in and forgot him. Innocent of the least violation of law, he suffered more that night than he ever did later as a convict in the penitentiary where he had been sentenced for burglary.[3]

Sophistication is merely a term to describe a protective shell that hides a helpless human being and has been built up gradually as a resistance to slights, misunderstandings and hurts. The parent who contributes to the growth of this shell by faulty char-

[3] Black, Jack: "You Can't Win." Macmillan Co., New York, 1926.

acterization of the traits of childhood is assuredly a bad parent.

A parent may be bad if some interest or impulse, however good in itself, becomes hypertrophied and grows at the expense of parental feeling.

Mary is a brilliant student in college who won a scholarship in mathematics. She consulted the school psychiatrist because she felt so unhappy in the midst of social activities. She spent her week-ends in her room. Sometimes she went to visit her aged parents in a neighboring town, but infrequently, as she returned depressed. The psychiatrist did not suggest that it was sex that ailed Mary. Her childhood had been spent on a farm, her college work in biology had been adequate. She did not shrink from men, but she found herself at twenty-two with no zest for life.

Her parents had no interest in her achievements. They were both intelligent and kindly. Religion was the dominant motive of her father's life; to him religion was the only door for truth. He took no happiness in his daughter's mental growth; it did not occur to him that mathematics is a search for truth also. Into his religion flowed no streams of modern humanism, science, or culture. His wife busied herself with church organization, and memberships. Both were stone blind to their daughter's personality.

In her childhood two incidents stood out clearly. When she was five, she danced with delight on receiving a red calico dress and was rebuked by her father for worldliness. When she was eleven, she was talking to a boy cousin in the cellar of her house, and was punished by her mother. She did not un-

derstand why she was punished. She did not resent it, but she could not forget the stern horror on her mother's face. In adolescence, there were family scenes because, although she attended church, it was plain her heart was not there.

Mary's awakening intellectual interests were as unbuttressed by family support as if both parents were non-existent, or spent their lives playing bridge. At first her curiosity about numbers, planes, and solids kept her satisfied. She had capacity for friendship, but her mental level was higher than that of her contemporaries and at home she had no training in games, or general conversation. She never felt she belonged to any group.

The psychiatrist explained to Mary the current doctrine of emancipation, urged her to see herself now as an adult, no longer in need of interested parents. Mary responded as conscientiously as she could, sought out human contacts, succeeding in making what is called an adjustment. But what might have been a delight still remains a duty, a sop thrown to the necessity of being "normal" in a world which has outgrown the solitary life.

Mary has been sacrificed on one of the oldest altars in the world: interest in religion which is so absorbing that it sucks out parental feeling.

A parent is bad who takes a fatalistic attitude toward a child's weakness, illness or defeat, and who cannot see behind a present handicap the background of latent strength.

Frank came to the school heart clinic with his mother. He had been sent there by the junior employment division for a medical examination before receiving a work permit. He wished to take a job

as messenger. The doctor said to the mother: "This boy cannot ride a bicycle. His heart muscle is weak." "I know he has heart trouble," said the mother. "The other doctor said that, but if he is going to drop dead he might as well die while riding a bicycle as any other way."

This mother loved her son. When the physician said: "God gave you the privilege of giving life to this boy, but not the right to take it away," she was stunned. When he explained the curious throbbing points and depressions revealed by the electrocardiograph, and said: "We have here only a heart that needs rest; put Frank to bed for two years and he will have a heart that amounts to something," she looked as stupefied as if he had recommended a hundred and fifty elephants for Frank to play with. It was not entirely her fault. Experts err greatly in making a diagnosis so gloomy that average people can see no way out. But parents are prone to accept fate blindly. They have expected so much. When they are told their child is not "normal" they lose hope. It seems to affect their prestige.

How sturdy is the contrast presented by a relatively uneducated father whose boy was born with two stubs for arms. This boy not only learned to care for himself and developed normally, but he played the violin. His father said: "When I learned of my son's cruel handicap I made three resolves:

"1. Never to pity him.

"2. Never help him to do anything that he can do for himself.

"3. Never let him wear stockings." [4]

[4] Case cited by Dr. Leonhard Seiff: Child Guidance Clinic of Munich, Germany. Boston lectures, May, 1927.

An entire philosophy of education is in these words. Parents must have an invincible faith in life, and the wisdom to let their children develop what they have regardless of the fact that the equipment vouchsafed may fall below their expectations.

Frank's mother was suspicious of the doctor. She scowled when he said:

"What is it you really wish to become? Is there not some plan or ambition up your sleeve?" Frank said he wanted to become a mechanical engineer.

"You cannot be that," said the doctor. "It is too hard. But you could be an electrical or chemical engineer. How old are you?"

"Sixteen," replied Frank.

This was eighteen months ago. Frank went to bed as the doctor directed. A shelf was rigged to support his books and electrical apparatus. Some sparks from the doctor's eager interest and assurance fell into Frank's being. The mother did not help him greatly. She was willing to wait upon him, but when he became impatient with the long rest and prowled about his room, she appeared more animated than when he lay quiet with a steady resolve to obey the doctor whom he loved. Maternal affection has strange laws. We do not understand it completely. When Frank went to bed, he was in the freshman year in high school. To-day he has the equipment of a senior. His interest in mechanics does not take the form of tinkering and lifting heavy masses; he has learned how to deal with the outside world with his intellect and emotions. He is equal to his task now. The days when he wished to tear all over town on his bicycle seem remote; his life is just beginning. He has won over difficulties

and compensated for a handicap that might easily have extinguished him.[5]

A parent is bad who tries to make the "child fit the home" or the "home fit the child" and has not grasped the idea of democracy in family life.

Mrs. G. lived in a "good" neighborhood. Property values were high; it was what is known as a "restricted" area. As committees seek more and more to control types of dwellings of householders, it is interesting to observe the ideas back of "restrictions." Apparently in planning "model homes" a highly restricted view of childhood has been at work. Many parents have difficulty with their children because they try to fit them into homes impossible for young human animals.

John, aged four and a half, was beginning to be a terrific problem. He had been expelled from two private kindergartens, and excluded from one of the children's parks where he was taken by his nurse in the afternoons. He could not play with other children. In the kindergarten he sat on a chair watching the others, suddenly he would swoop down, scatter toys, destroy bridges and towers, push the children over; in the park he pelted little girls, dragged little boys off their sleds, made himself such a nuisance that the policeman told him he could not play there any more.

In his home he dug holes in the grass-plot in the front yard, disturbing the groomed monotony of the street and probably lowering real estate values. He

[5] This case has been "reconstructed" from the records of Dr. Harry Lissner, director of the Los Angeles Heart Clinic of the Public Schools. Similar cases show a large percentage of recoveries, provided the child's interest is aroused, and the parents coöperate.

splashed water on the pastel tinted walls of his bed room, littered the living room with his play-things, slid down the bannisters and broke a Chinese porcelain. He had been a serene and happy baby. At three his conduct began to distress his mother by its unexpected and destructive quality. Every morning when he emerged spotless and adorable from his bath she tried to reason with him. Punishment and bribery were used.

John sometimes got the point. He would sit quietly on a stool looking at pictures, or would run an automatic engine over the slippery hardwood floors. When his father returned from the office he would romp violently with John, buffeting, tussling him until the little boy became flushed and exhausted. His parents had not the slightest notion of cause and effect. They believed that the tiny spotless house, the treeless, narrow, "subdivided" lot, the "restful" shades chosen by an interior decorator, the fussy hangings and elaborate furniture which so well expressed their strivings for "refinement" made a desirable home. That John needed untrammeled space, dirt, water, tools, nails, boards, and playmates never occurred to them. They expended all their energy and John's in a useless attempt to adapt him to an environment hostile to his every need.

Finally his parents sent him to a progressive nursery school. There he learned to manipulate objects and was beginning to take part in games. His teacher gave his nurse some large hollow blocks, for building a house big enough for him to get into. He made a treasure chest at the school and painted it. She suggested that a little tent be put up in the back yard. His mother objected because it interfered with the landscape effect, she resented his com-

ing home wet and sandy from the school. Her idea of play was to provide a mechanical toy. But John's nurse was intelligent enough to follow the teacher's direction, she herself taught him to weave. John's father insisted that he have the tent. In a few weeks John was as much engrossed in his own affairs as any business man. Each morning he went to school eagerly, he spent his afternoons in his tent, methodically packed and unpacked his belongings in the treasure chest. When his father came home there was no more "rough house." John was too busy in showing off his clay camels, and wooden ships. Mrs. G. one day decided to go to Europe and departed taking John with her. Her plan was to stay a week in each of the fashionable hotels. Again John would have to "adjust," after being uprooted. One wonders if individuals who have no ability to carry anything to conclusion, who have discontinuity of interests, have not been thus robbed in childhood. Unbothered children possess certain priceless assets, while children who have been made to fit into some "refined" homes may not be fit for anything else.

Erma was a girl of fourteen. Her parents, after half a lifetime of struggle, found themselves financially comfortable. Erma's ideas of a good time had been formed at the neighborhood movie and a fashionable high school. She demanded noise constantly, radio, phonograph and player piano. There was no privacy for any one. She filled the house with boys and girls, like herself jazz-drunk. Before breakfast there were girls dancing on the living room floor, and after midnight, "Crazy Words," and "What, No Spinach!" jerked out their imbecile rhythms. Erma's parents did not interfere because they were proud of

their daughter's popularity. They reorganized their home. The father who was fond of reading, gave it up. The mother consulted Erma about cosmetics and dress. Whatever the young people were doing seemed more important than her own pursuits. The home fitted Erma's apparent requirements but no normal adult could find comfort there.

Analyzing the attempts of some juvenile court parents they fall into these two groups, making the child fit into the home, or making the home "fit" for the child. Neither solution is right. Neither child, nor parent, should dominate the home. Each has rights, duties, responsibilities, needs, points of view which should be pooled. Undoubtedly it takes great skill. Some one has to engineer the process. That the task belongs to the mother is undoubted. She will require knowledge of the biological and social requirements of infancy, childhood, youth, maturity and old age. Homes will have to be rebuilt, neatness, prestige and useless possessions may have to go. But a healthy child cannot survive in an environment "restricted" to the tastes of adults, and the family cannot proceed toward democracy until it begins to recognize and conserve the values of each member.

A parent is bad who repudiates a child in dire need.

This letter was written by a girl about to become an unmarried mother:

"Dear Sister Marie:

"I am sorry for you, dear, that we could not all live together and be happy. Sis, I'll never be happy again. Darling, I am not sorry for myself,

but I'm sorry, so sorry for all my folks. I'll tell you a secret and then even you will turn against me. I am going to have a baby unless Dad will let Riffey slip it for me. They are going to put Lawrence in the pen when they find him. He asked Dad five or six times to let us marry and he said we were too young. So I made Lawrence beat it out of the country. I hope to God they won't find him unless they let us marry, for I love him as I do no one else on God's earth. I would rather see him dead than in the pen. Dad said he was going to keep me. Mother won't want me now. No one will like me but I would go through it again for Lawrence. Sis, he is gone. He took my advice and they are going to have him found. They got his picture to help go by. If they won't let him marry I hope with all my heart they don't find him. My baby will be here in five months if I go ahead and have it. If it is a boy I will call it Lawrence, for I love him.

"If you love your heartbroken Sis, write to me. If you don't, I don't care to live any longer.

"ALICE.

"P.S. Dad is writing to mother to tell her. Grandpa said he would shoot Lawrence so I begged him to leave. I don't know where he is."

Alice is seventeen. She lived in a small country town and was permitted by her parents to go with Lawrence as often as she pleased. The young man was "trusted." When they asked to marry they were told they "were nothing but babies." Confronted with the humiliating outcome of the young people's inexperience and their own blindness to biology, all the parents can fall back upon is the "gun

and the penitentiary." Parents, as Adolf Meyer has said, need a good dose of preparedness in facing life for their children.[6]

To repudiate a child in dire need is to fail as a parent. That parents "naturally" feel like disowning a child who disgraces them is disproved by hundreds of case-records compiled by social workers who have aided the parents of unmarried mothers and fathers into sturdy acceptance of their share in the responsibility.

Sentimentalists often picture mothers brokenheartedly sobbing over the bodies of sons executed for crime. This is rarely a true picture. Criminals commonly face their doom alone. It is not that the repudiation comes suddenly as the result of the offender's acts; it goes far back into the early childhood. As Adler and others have shown, it is the unwanted child who becomes delinquent.[7]

A parent is bad whose imagination is colored by an uncritical acceptance of vague rumors of scandal about young people. Such parents have no sense of proportion, are ready to accept the worst because it fits in with their theories. Adults may become the largest contributing factor to the breakdown of youthful reputation, even of their own children.

Mrs. Abbot kept a clean home. Her children were well behaved, Tom eight, Sara four, and Ruth fifteen. Ruth went to high school. Mrs. Abbot was a favorite with her neighbors, who were always

[6] Meyer, Adolf: "What Can a Democratic Civilization Do About Eugenics and Child Welfare?" Public National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 370 7th Avenue, New York City.

[7] Adler, Alfred: "Character and Talent." *Harper's Magazine,* New York.

dropping in for card parties. The excitement was not in the cards but in the conversation. Mrs. Abbot loved to talk about young people. She told the neighbors that Mary Morrison was so tough she had to be sent away to a reform school. (Mary was in the County Hospital having her tonsils out.) Mrs. Abbot believed that the man who ran the soft drink parlor at the corner sold bootleg to the high school boys and that the girls danced half-naked on the tables. When Emma, aged sixteen, came to the Juvenile Court for running away from home, she said that her boy friend's mother had been over to Mrs. Abbot's.

"Mrs. Abbot told her I was the worst girl in the neighborhood. His mother told Fred, and he told all the gang. Fred laughed at me and said: 'You've sure got a bad reputation. Mother says I mustn't go with you.' Now I had never gone the limit, but they all kept teasing me, so when Fred got sore when I wouldn't go with his boy friend, I just thought I'd step out to show them I wasn't afraid. Now I'd like to go into a private family. I can't make good back at home with Mrs. Abbot talking about me."

One day at high school Fred was called into the principal's office to explain why he had been absent one afternoon. He had driven a party of girls to the beach, he said, and talked frankly about it until they sent for his mother. She said she did not believe it was possible; if Fred had done it, it was the girls' fault. She repeated the stories she had heard at Mrs. Abbot's. Fred admitted that the girls coaxed him. "How many girls are not all they should be in this school?" asked the principal. Fred

said he did not know of a girl who wouldn't let him kiss her.

That night at Mrs. Abbot's there was a great party and the beginning of a vague, insidious scandal about the high school: that eighteen girls had had to leave last year because of "trouble," that 70 per cent of both boys and girls drank, that a larger number were immoral. The neighbors were puzzled, and a little thrilled. Personally, they did not know of a single girl "in trouble," but an atmosphere of anxiety and suspicion settled over the school community.

One evening when Mrs. Abbot went upstairs she found Ruth missing. She reported to the court that the girl had been kidnaped by a gang of bootleggers and white-slavers. Ruth was found in half an hour at the corner store drinking an ice cream soda. By this time, however, Mrs. Abbot had told the police her entire story of the high school. It took three weeks of patient investigation and several court hearings to follow each thread of gossip to its source. When it was all over, out of a school population of 2,000 emerged half a dozen young people who kept late hours, many who "petted," a few boys and girls who occasionally smoked and drank, a feeble-minded girl who wrote objectionable notes, three who had run away from home and were on probation. All the rest—the dark stories of promiscuity, abortions, illegitimate babies, habitual drunkenness—were utterly without foundation. Many of the girls and boys boasted of things which never happened and "confessed" to experiences they had lived through only in imagination.

Ruth suffered the most. She is a pale, wistful child with a self-conscious manner, who remains on

the fringe of any group. What little prestige she had has disappeared. She is conspicuous, yet unpopular with students and teachers. Mrs. Abbot is hardly satisfied with the investigation. She thinks it is still possible that "these things" are going on "under cover."

A parent is bad who has a warped view of authority and is thereby unable to make use of social resources.

This letter was written by a mother to a probation officer:

"Mrs. C.:

"I see you left me a note to come to see you. I am sorry to state it is impossible for me to lay off to come and I am not able to spend the money. At present I don't see how I'll get the money to send her up court day. Perhaps something may happen between now and then. I have too many worries all coming together. If you folks had to make your living by hard work you would cut out a whole lot of this affair. Life is almost too hard without this extra of worrying the life out of me. You keep the child advertised until she can't have any nice friends and follow her up and me as to where we work until no one will let us work after a-while because she has been in the reform school, and I am the mother of her. A friend of a child that had once had one side step would be very careful to not let it get known, thereby giving her a chance to make good. After a-while if you still keep on no one of a good character will go with her and then how much of a chance are you giving her? To come into my home and publish her

to her friends like you did is almost unforgivable, and then to question my children as to where I work and why I quit is an insult to me you had no right to give. You wait until I break a law before insulting me. When you find a woman that can show any cleaner sheet tell me about it. I am a born hundred-per-cent American and I have a right to live in this country. The only way I can do any better by my children is for you to furnish the money for me to live on. From my way of seeing things you are doing more to ruin the child's life than all the boys did. You seem to think you are dealing with toughs. All I ever do is to ask a right to live. I let the other fellows alone and bother no one and my children have the same name by everybody that knows them. Why you want to ruin them or me is more than I know. If I had the money to get out of the state I would do it and know then my breathing the same air wouldn't bother you no more.

"Mrs. Brown."

Mrs. Brown in her vigorous vulgarity speaks for a great many parents who have had far more education. She is of the type of personality that is called paranoid. She is hopelessly warped at the point of intake. Her child, Ernestine, is on probation to the most kindly and considerate of women. None of the things of which Mrs. Brown complains ever happened. Ernestine was never in a reform school, her probation officer never advertised her to her friends nor questioned her about her mother's work. On the contrary, she secured a scholarship for the girl and financial aid for the mother. Ernestine is rather ashamed of her mother, who

holds violent opinions against school teachers, churches, libraries, and all public officials. Mrs. Brown constantly nags and upbraids her children and accuses them of countless offenses they have not committed. She is always bringing them to court saying: "Now you give them a good scare," but she is temperamentally unable to maintain consistent discipline. She rebels against the most tactful show of authority. It is true that her personality, indolent, selfish and obstructive, has been formed under the shadow of an idea of persecution which lifts her out of the normal range, but many normal parents have the same poor adjustment to authority, which makes it impossible for their children to succeed in school, or to make use of the social resources to which, in the modern world, we must constantly turn in order to live.

Parents are bad who labor under the delusion that law-enforcement applies only to "others," those who live in poverty or are of different race or culture.

It is a shock to most parents to see their children in need of correction by the state. A good parent, however, will seek any constructive means to safeguard a child who has slipped into the muddy currents of commercialized recreation, or is about to be destroyed by pleasure-hunting.

Dorothy's father was the kind of man who approved of his local crime commission's demand for longer, harder sentences and abolition of probation and parole. He hated Jews and foreigners and was emphatic in his criticism of lax public officials and bootleggers.

Dorothy was the kind of girl who comes to court "accidentally," through violation of traffic regulations. She was driving her car fifty-three miles an

hour in a 15-mile zone. This was the second time it had happened. She was sixteen. She told the judge that if she had to be arrested, she wished she had been going really fast, not just poking along. Her parents did not think it necessary to come to court. Her young married brother said: "It serves Sis right." However, when the judge decided to hold Dorothy in the detention home for a few days, every one came to court with indignant protest—two lawyers, a family doctor, a school teacher from a select boarding-school, and half a dozen friends.

The mother said that Dorothy was under the care of the doctor, her "nerves" would never survive the shock of being detained with "common offenders." The court hearing was an "outrage." The family was "absolutely respectable." She appealed to the doctor for confirmation. He answered her with monosyllables. Dorothy looked the picture of health. For two years she had driven her own car, attended dances with friends of whom her family never heard; she had a latch-key. In short, Dorothy was a young person without the slightest parental supervision. Her mother spent a great deal of time crying in a darkened room; she considered herself an unfortunate woman. Her father spent most of his time at his club. They finally admitted they knew nothing whatever about Dorothy's affairs; it was an intolerable annoyance now to be asked about them. They took the attitude that such court procedure was insulting, not meant for their "kind of home" but for the poor and immigrant.

Gradually they were made to face facts. Dorothy returned to her boarding-school under supervision. She is not a fortunate girl. She is, in truth, extremely needy.

A parent is bad who does not realize that with adolescence comes a tremendous pull of loyalty towards friends outside the family group.

Mr. Smith was a university student volunteering as a Big Brother in the Y. M. C. A. He was successful with his boys as long as they obeyed him, or were "responsive," but he was not helpful as a social worker because he could not get along with parents. In a controversy he always took the boy's side. He seemed to think a case was solved when a child was removed to a foster-home. It is not definite enough to dismiss his successes and failures as due to the strong homosexual complement in his nature, a nature sunny, disciplined and held to the highest standards of personal behavior. Something had biased him against parents.

For example, when a mother objected to letting her boy go to a summer camp, he shouted: "Why not?"

"Because I'll not have him running with Jim. It is Jim that has caused the trouble, and turned him against his home."

The young man became excited: "You don't know what you are doing. You are ruining your son's life."

Mr. Smith was not at that moment present in the court room at all; he was reliving a scene in his own boyhood. His mother had married at seventeen, and her contact with the outside world had ceased. When Mr. Smith was twenty-three, his mother wrote him on his birthday: "I hope you see nothing more of Henry. I have always considered Henry's influence over you bad. It is nothing short of poison." Mr. Smith could never forgive his mother for not understanding his friendship for

Henry. It began when the boys were sixteen. Henry introduced him to poetry and philosophy. They read Nietzsche and Freud. Overnight there were subtle changes, the boy whose elbows were always out, and who wept if his mother forgot to kiss him good-night, suddenly became aloof, self-determined, thoughtful and aggressive. No wonder his mother thought him "poisoned." Nothing changes a child so rapidly as the new ideas gained in romantic friendship. An experienced parent bides his time, he has faith in the growth process, he is far too wise and too filled with love to wound his son in the most sensitive place available in adolescence, where hero-worship lodges.

Mrs. Smith, by tactlessness and intolerance, not only lost her child, but warped him so that his gifts are no longer effective in dealing with people. All his life he will misread the parent-child relationship because he sees it through lenses colored by his own unhappiness.

For a parent to become prematurely stabilized so that he cannot take in fresh experience nor distinguish between major and minor values is to become a bad parent.

Robert had to be removed from his family because they turned him out. He was a pleasant boy of fifteen, well along in school, athletic and manly.

He came from an interesting family. His grandfather had been an itinerant preacher with eleven children, all of whom achieved distinction. The preacher had a strange custom of taking his entire family on excursions into the hills to look for a special kind of granite on which he had set his heart for his tombstone. He had been resting under it

forty years when his grandson Robert came to juvenile court. Robert's youngest uncle was a lawyer. He had had to educate himself and never saw his father again after he was fifteen. On that occasion he had been confronted by a family council. On the parlor table lay his collection of bones bearing labels and arranged in a series. At this evidence of godlessness and belief in evolution Robert's uncle was mute. He placed his shoulders against the wall and defied every one. When he was ordered to leave the house, or quit ranging the prairies for specimens, he walked twenty miles to the next town, was taken in by an old judge, and settled down to study.

Robert's father was a teacher and in all things the reverse of his rebellious brother. He was a stern disciplinarian. His ideas of right and wrong were immovably fixed, covering not only the field of morals in their primary sense, honesty, chastity and piety, but manners and fashions as well. It was right to wear black, or blue suits of clothes, wrong to wear green, or checks, right to wear the hair parted on the side, wrong to plaster it back with brilliantine. He not only hated automobiles, radio and movies, but a new manner of speaking, dancing, or thinking made him uncomfortable. That is to say he had become stabilized at a comparatively early age and could not take in new experience.

Robert was like his uncle. In addition to that he had been found smoking cigarettes. "I have told my classes in high school," said the father, "that if a boy of mine should smoke cigarettes I would turn him out." So a few dried weeds in a slender tube of white paper had severed the relationship between father and son.

Parents are bad who permit a thwarted love-life to pervert their relationship to their child.

This letter was written by a girl to her probation officer:

"My Dear Friend:

"I've had a pretty hard time lately so I'm writing to you for advice, which I think you expect me to do. It's the same old story of mother and dad.

"Dad kisses me and mother gets sore and makes sarcastic remarks to daddy including me. Then dad gets sore and hollers at mother. Then they both start fighting over me. Mother positively don't want dad to kiss me. While dad, on the other hand, if I don't let him kiss me, is perfectly horrid and my life is miserable one way or the other. I can't imagine what to do in a case like that. I hate to start to be enemies with dad and I equally dislike the prospect of enemies with mother so I turn to you as a last source of help. You have helped me with advice over a good many things. Can you help me in this? Hoping this finds you happier than I am, I remain, your bewildered.

"Marion."

Marion is struggling with the gravest complexities of human relationships. She came to the court only because her parents quarreled over what school they would send her to and finally kept her out altogether. Marion appeared to be a carefree girl but she was not happy at home. Only after months of patient friendliness on the part of the court, did the deep source of grief reveal itself. Jealousy had crept

into the family. Her father and mother were unhappily married. To the mother, the daughter was a rival in combat for the father's interest. To the father, however unconsciously, the daughter was a kind of substitute wife. His parental rôle was overshadowed by an emotion he believed to be fatherly affection, yet, had he examined it more closely, he would have discovered it wore a different face. Marion is helpless between currents of adult emotion which she can neither appease, nor satisfy.

A parent may be bad if the goal placed before the child is too immediate, and too easy, or is so concerned with money and comfort that the children become bored with life.

Vivian, at fourteen, was profoundly discontented. Most of the girls at the "opportunity school" to which she had been sent by the court were older, but Vivian had a "mature outlook," which made her say the tennis tournament was "baby stuff," the dancing was "hick stuff." She ridiculed the girls for liking the circus, she took no part in camp-fires, hikes, dramatics, swimming, yelling, and masquerade parties. She had run away from home with two sailors, become infected with gonorrhea and had to spend a long time in the hospital. It was supposed, after these tragic experiences, she would delight in the freedom of the school in the country, but although there was no lock, bolt, nor bar, she called it a "baby Sing Sing." After four months she insisted on being removed, because "there is nothing to interest me here."

Her mother agreed with the girl. "Let me take her home. My affairs are different now." (She was beginning to receive her alimony regularly.) "I can

give her so much more. She always resented not being dressed like her sister." (Her sister was nineteen and an usherette in a fashionable movie.) "I can show her good times."

As the court looked doubtful, the mother broke out into crude statement of her philosophy of life. "How would you like to be cooped up? I want to tell you you can't stop a young girl from pleasure. Spirit crushing is not up-lift."

This mother is a law-abiding citizen. Her life is respectable. When Vivian became "immoral" the mother was outraged, she would have agreed to a short term of penal servitude to teach Vivian a lesson, had that been the practice of the juvenile court. She submitted to the humiliations a parent must undergo in our barbarous procedure of prosecution of men responsible for a girl's delinquency. She acquiesced in the quarantine medical treatment, but she could not grasp the point of view of a court that concerned itself in changing Vivian's ideas of a good time. When the court expressed opinion that Vivian's concept of pleasure was dangerous in itself, the mother felt baffled and insulted.

Her highest goal of a good home contained a well-set table, a "real good" bed, comfortable furniture, popular music, magazines, sofa pillows, an income sufficient for shows, rides, parties, and the latest thing in clothes. She expected her girls to have enough common sense not to "go too far." She did not realize that, in making life so easy, she had cheapened it till it became hardly worth the effort. This mother had deprived her children of the struggle that is fundamental, not only to the development of morality, and the growth of personality, but to the experience of the thrill of happiness.

A parent is bad who is a parent only spasmodically, and then usually at the wrong time.

"Dear Miss X—

"Please keep me informed about Helen. I am resting in this beautiful spot. If Helen wants to be self-supporting perhaps it is just as well to let her try it. But I certainly do not want her to enter Library School. She had planned always to go to college. I do not think she ought to associate with Sybil. Now that I am far away I have to depend upon you. Please do not leave everything to Helen's judgment.

"Sincerely,

"Mrs. G.

"P.S. I wish you would help me get Marie into the F—— School."

This mother has four exceptionally bright and attractive children. When they were babies she divorced their father for infidelity. Since then she has relied on churches, courts and social agencies to bring them up. The two little boys were placed in private homes. The mother pays no board, sees them occasionally, criticizes their manners, but otherwise takes no interest in them. She has refused to relinquish them for adoption. The boys have a wistful attitude of not quite belonging to their foster-parents, whom they love. Their mother is like a sovereign who appears only when some one threatens her claim of ownership.

Marie, aged thirteen, is very happy. At eight she was placed in a boarding-school. Every three or four months the mother writes to the social worker to change Marie's school or to provide music les-

sons, or not to let her bob her hair, or go with some particular girl.

Helen, the oldest girl, has worked her way through high school and has saved $180. She is a moody, tyrannical young person, but, after years of struggle, finally has adjusted herself to her own temperament and to intercourse with her fellow human beings. On being received into the Library School, she wrote wistfully: "Perhaps mother will not consider me such a failure after all. I wish you would write her."

But the mother is not quite satisfied. She would prefer a different career for her daughter.

In her mind, the parental rôle is vested with final authority, without the inconvenience of carrying the burdens of daily intercourse. Similarly many fathers seem to think that their duty is fulfilled when they "take a hand" in time of trouble or appear in an emergency. Parenthood, however, is not in this act or that act; it is a process requiring continuous interest and devotion.

A parent is bad who permits the family atmosphere to become infected with his "inferiority complex."

A boy of seventeen came before the court because he had forged a check. His sister had been there before as a witness in the cases of two girls who had run away from home. Both young people were of superior intelligence and came of a fine family. The mother was of unusual charm. She had married early to escape the tyranny of a nagging mother, five hypercritical brothers, and the adoration of a father who expected her to become his ideal of a perfect woman. Her husband never ceased his

courtship, although it had grown a little falsetto, after twenty years. The children aided him in reassurance that she was loved, that she was good-looking, cooked better meals than any one, talked more interestingly, played a better game of bridge, was a better mother, managed her household more efficiently than any other woman. The mother needed this perpetual bath of praise and affection. Her letters to her children always contained little innuendoes suggesting that she felt hurt or slighted. She conveyed this impression by veiled allusion to the way some other wife or mother was disregarded in the home of relative or neighbor. No one ever heard her complain, but she made her children's hearts ache for her. They were always fearing that father had been too abrupt. They had concealed from their mother since early childhood anything which might trouble her. They made light of difficulties, evaded questions of religion or sex which might shock her. Secretly they did as they pleased, but at home they passed for model children. The unwholesomeness of the restrained family atmosphere was caused by the fact that each member felt it was impossible to tell the truth and get along with the others. The thing started in the surrender of a beautiful, accomplished young mother to a subtle feeling of inferiority, which had its onset from a sensitive, over-punished, over-praised childhood.

The effect on her son was unexpected. He was a most lovable boy. Any one could have forgiven him annoyance, or inconvenience, but he could not bear to admit he was ever in the wrong. He had formed the habit of making excuses. He told countless little lies so as not to hurt people's feelings. His

legs might be late to an appointment; he never admitted *he* was late. He did not wish any one on earth to think ill of him, or of themselves. Everything was always all right. When he got tired of a job he did not face his employer and say he was quitting, he sent a telegram to himself announcing that his mother was ill. In years of anxious watching of his mother's face for signs of disapproval he had become so responsive to the feelings of others that he had never in his life been frank about his own feelings. Hence he never made a real friend. He believed that every situation could be "fixed up," without a "show-down." So when he ran out of funds he forged a check. Dishonesty in its more engaging form had become so natural to him that he was scarcely conscious that he had suddenly become a "criminal."

The court hearing fell on him with the sting of cold salt water. Being unusually intelligent and imaginative, he learned more in that hour than he had in his life-time. There were, of course, relapses into the old excuse-forming habits of evasion and indirection, but he was headed in the opposite direction. His sudden outspokenness almost broke his parents' hearts. His bluntness caused his mother more grief than the forgery. She could interpret that as a *mistake,* she could not face a son who had laid aside all his tender little diplomacies.

The daughter had become infected with the mother's "inferiority complex" in a different way. She had an exaggerated recoil from pain, particularly the sufferings of others. When a girl friend had a grievance against her home, she over-stimulated it. People loved to tell her their troubles because she discovered little sufferings they had over-

looked. She was attuned to tragedy as some delicate instrument that caught the least vibration and made it throb. Finding a mate was out of question, her ideal of human harmonies was too high. Friendship began with romantic tension and ended in tears. She never found a man, woman or child who could appreciate her. The court will never have much to do with this girl. She wept when she was warned that it is unlawful and unkind to encourage other girls to leave home, she felt this reprimand was one more instance of the world's injustice and cruelty. She will withdraw more completely now within herself, or seek companionship from other self-pitying neurotics under cover.

A parent is bad who cannot shield a child from premature exposure to adult anxiety or perplexity.

If one judges from court-room impressions, one is likely to fall into the belief that the bad parents—or those likely to be called that carelessly—are the ones who inspire the most love. The child of the woman who drinks too much is so often passionately loyal. Perhaps there is a deeper layer in the child-parent relationship which we do not understand. So often what we call a bad home situation has no bad effect upon the child, and again things may appear well yet the child shows distress.

A throng of child-custody cases comes to mind. Take one in which the father accuses the mother of immorality. There is evidence that would justify removing the child, but the erring parent is given another chance. Outwardly the mother submits to conventions, accepts supervision, her neighbors respect her; but something is wrong and the child reveals it mutely. Loss of appetite, change of posture, a

"frozen" attitude, night terrors, delinquencies, and many other symptoms of emotional difficulty present themselves. And just as recent studies show that disorders in nutrition may be traced, not to the physiology of the child but to the over-anxiety of the parent, so in court we may trace delinquencies in young children to the emotional strains they undergo in adult company.

In contrast, in these other cases where children really thrive with parents who break laws, violate customs, and appear unfit, one suspects there is at work, after all, some hidden integrity of personality which shelters the child from witnessing the conflict, if there is one. It may be better for a child to live with this doubtful sort of parent than with the over-scrupulous, harassed, worried, apprehensive parent who would seem, on first sight, to be a better influence. "Wholesome neglect" is sometimes better than too much attention in the concerns both of the body and of the spirit of children.

For older adolescents there is no reason to shrink from exposure to reality. But the young child should not share the moral, religious and social struggles of his parents. Let them present a sound front to the child.[8]

A parent is bad who will not let a child grow up, who does all the talking, makes all the decisions, meets all the issues, and exercises perpetual chaperonage.

A young college student came before a counselor for permission to carry a double load of work. He was nineteen. His mother was present at the interview which she practically conducted. The young

[8] Compare Henry James, "What Maisie Knew."

man sat and smiled. Before he could answer a question the mother had launched forth volubly: "He is perfectly capable. It is of no significance that he got B's last year. His teachers were not fair. He can easily carry twenty-eight credits. I have arranged everything now so he will not be disturbed,"—et cetera.

The counselor was unsuccessful in eliciting any response from the boy. Finally he said: "Young man, I would like to talk to your father." The student looked startled and the mother said with finality: "It is not necessary." She did not yield when the interview was declared closed. She considered herself the sole manager of her son.

The word *manage* is one frequently used by parents. Anciently it had to do with the government of a horse.[9]

The child subjected to this concept of the rôle of parenthood may not bear the marks of bit, bridle, saddle, spur, or whip; nevertheless, when he finds himself without a rider, he may find it impossible to take his place in the modern world, with its demands, not so much for submission, as participation.

Chaperonage is, fortunately, disappearing, through ridicule and ineptitude, from the modern world. Parents who do not know there is a modern world, where, as Havelock Ellis puts it, each person must play his part in its creation, are bad parents.

A parent is bad who does not wholeheartedly inculcate the idea of family formation for the next generation.

The neighbor agreed to come in and sit with Edith's mother. This was no hardship to the neigh-

[9] Skeat's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language.

bor because the mother was attractive. She had a personality with an individual flavor like the tang of a mountain apple. There was no reason why she should be known to every one as Edith's mother, except that she expected it. She had been left a widow when Edith was seven; since then she had supported them both. She read widely, had a circle of friends and kept a comfortable home.

Edith was now twenty-two, an only child, married to a young automobile salesman. She worked in a bank. When she married her mother gave consent. It was understood that she was "not to lose" Edith. Arthur was to live with them and augment the little retinue. The mother was to keep house, a thing she had longed to devote her life to. At first all went well. When the young people began to go out in the evening together, Arthur to business meetings, Edith to night-school, when they returned from some dance, the mother's greeting was crisp, and charged with double meaning.

One day suddenly she took to her bed. It had never happened before. Edith was terribly frightened. The doctor agreed that the mother should stay in bed. Her whole system was depleted. She was pale, anemic, and had lost muscular tone. There was nothing organic; her condition would clear with rest.

Edith responded to her mother's helplessness with a passion she had never shown to Arthur. Never strong before, she had the strength of two. She kept her job. They were buying a car and paying for furniture on installments. At night she ministered to her mother. Soon the doctor said jokingly he could not tell which was the patient. The mother's cheeks became flushed with delicate color,

Edith became like wax. She began to develop strange fears. Over her desk she suddenly saw her mother lying ill, or faint. She thought she might be dying, that she would stop breathing, or get out of bed, and over-exert herself.

The daughter's attentions to the mother were variously described by the neighbors as "beautiful" or "too bad," according to their point of view. The entire household, including the doctor, were blind to the fundamental issue; they were busily absorbed in the routine of filial piety, in the details of religious observance of the most exacting religion on earth—that of an invalid parent.

On the occasion of the neighbor's visit Edith's mother had said:

"Edith, of course, did not wish to go to this dinner. She had to; it is her college anniversary. She has refused everything all winter. Poor Edith—she will be a mighty unhappy girl sometime—she cannot have her mother always."

The neighbor was not interested. She was in the first flush of a new religion. She talked with such eloquence that some spark of her enthusiasm kindled a little fire in the heart of the invalid. She decided it might be worth while to get out of bed.

Edith's mother never developed insight. She embraced the religion, wistfully began to take up the threads of life she had laid aside, conquered inertia and the habits of being waited upon. She sent her doctor packing. She cannot see that the trouble began when she experienced Edith's marriage and learned that her child had a longing for a home and children of her own. Intellectually she would have said this was right, and natural. Emotionally she had never faced the possibility that Edith could do

without her. She is, for practical purposes, not a bad parent now, but her illness has robbed Edith of courage; there will always be a little shadow on her relationship to her husband, and the child that is coming.

CHAPTER V

SOME MODERN OBSTACLES TO SUCCESSFUL PARENTHOOD

THE modern parent knows that his efforts may be nullified by forces outside the home, with which no parent can struggle single handed. Hence he is interested in clean water and milk supply, public health departments, traffic control, adequate policing, and, to a lesser extent, because he is so unsophisticated that he cannot see the connection, decent politics. For the majority of parents in America the hostilities of the physical environment have been mitigated by science and social work. There remain other obstacles to successful parenthood which we call modern because their origin is in psychological and social habits of thought and feeling. Parents have been overwhelmed by collective stupidities in all civilizations, but they are especially numerous in periods of transition. If groups of enlightened parents were conscious of them they might better protect their homes. We are menaced no longer by famines and epidemics, but we are confronted with many ideas inimical to childhood.

Encroachments on the prolongation of youth.

To many thoughtless adults, a child's growing up is a troublesome process to be dispatched as quickly as possible. If they were asked to assign any value to the helplessness of infancy, they could find none, save possibly the provision of occupation and enjoy-

ment to those who have parental feeling. While the importance to mankind of a slowly ripening youth has been known to a few great men in every generation, its scientific meaning has escaped the majority of parents and teachers.

Teachers commonly see nothing detrimental in producing regiments of boys and girls whose conduct, speech and work show no genuine childishness, but might as easily be the output of a "reduced adult." Parents are usually not alarmed when children develop premature sedateness, thrift, filial respect and conscientiousness. Audiences of mothers and fathers are not revolted when a child of four or five appears on the stage, aping the gestures, clothes, dances and songs of street-walkers, drunken sailors, or movie-favorites. The word used to describe these performances is "cute." People are amused to see children imitating the faults of adults, even when the children cannot understand their full meaning.

" 'It was a bachelor and a bishop who drew up most cleverly the indictment of the faults of childhood' . . . 'children are haughty, disdainful, angry, envious, curious, interested, idle, fickle, timid, intemperate, lying, given to dissimulation; . . . they do not like to suffer ill, but love to inflict it; they are already men.' " [1]

It is this misinterpreted aspect of childhood that is most frequently demanded of child-actors in the movies. In Los Angeles alone 25,000 children have been granted permits to work in moving pictures.

[1] La Bruyere—in his chapter on "Man," written in the 17th century, quoted by Alexander Chamberlain "The Child." Walter Scott Publishing Company. London, 1911, 2nd Ed., p. 362.

While most of these are for three to five days, fully 5,000 children are permanently employed.[2] They range in age from merest infants to sixteen. They go to school on the premises, to teachers selected by the City School Department, but with salaries paid by the movie industry. Hours and conditions of work for these children are "regulated," but no regulation affecting children can be very effective in the fourth largest industry in the United States.[3] Parents themselves are the worst offenders. They push their children forward, and resent interference. Even educators fall into the current delusion:

One said: "Opportunity given these professional children is the very best. They are better educated, better behaved, more precocious, because of their contact with the culture of the movies.

The culture of the movies!

To a group of parents who went to protest against a specific misuse of childhood, another reply was: "It is good for children to be in the movies; they tend to uplift the pictures."

Children have suddenly acquired a money value greater in many instances than the combined labor of all the adults in the family. A sub-director expressed it when an employee was berating a mother of a child actor for some annoyance: "Don't kill the goose that laid the golden egg."

Still, at bottom, it is the old wish to see the child shine to advantage that causes the parent to subject him to speed, excitement, irregular hours, constant exhibitionism, and association with neurotic

[2] Study undertaken by Mrs. Gladys Moulton. June 1927, a member of a Class in Parent-Education, Los Angeles, Calif.

[3] Brucker, Herbert: In the *World's Work,* October, 1926, Vol. LII.

adults. And the mother who takes her child to see the movies frequently wishes that it were *her* child who is recognized by millions.

It is this widespread contagion that is an obstacle to successful parenthood. We may dismiss the tired, self-conscious, depleted movie-child from our minds; the number of children who possess the combination of talent, opportunity and unwise parents is too small to affect our entire parenthood, but we cannot dismiss the spectacle of applauding millions.[4] *What* is applauded is not the gifted child using his talent beautifully and naturally, so that our concept of childhood is enriched. It is the ability of the child to mimic distorted adult behavior, or a distorted adult's idea of what a child is.

The illusion of the movies is so great that adults who might have compassion for a child of three weeping violently forget that in order to make those tears appear, a real child has been deliberately coaxed, threatened, frightened, or over-stimulated. Cultivated people no longer enjoy dances of bears taught on burning plates. They would rather go to the zoo. Nowadays the only successful animal shows are those which seem to please the animals.

That the average parent sees nothing distressing in the false images of childhood, daily presented, is a symptom that we have succumbed to a grave social disease. It is symbolic of what is going on everywhere in American life, a gradual encroachment upon the span of childhood and youth. Child labor is grievous, but labor in mines, shops, factories, and on street corners is not so pernicious as a systematic prostitution of the talents of childhood. What the

[4] It is estimated that the paid admissions total annually 500 million in the United States.

culture historian of a hundred years from now will think of us we cannot guess. We are disgusted at our ancestors for laughing at the antics of cripples, and, in some instances, for producing cripples artificially. Perhaps our children will be just as revolted at our idea of amusement in the twentieth century.

This, to be sure, is nothing new. If a study were made of the child-motif in art one would find abundant material for doubting whether any but the supremely great among artists have known how to interpret children, save in terms of the adult. Paintings of children usually depict them in attitudes no child takes of his own accord. A group of Juvenile Navigators are shown sailing a boat in a miniature garden pool. A boy of eight is foppishly displaying his calves clad in the tight trousers of young men of the early nineteenth century. Another leans affectedly on a cane. A little girl is dressed in skirts that reach the ground. The whole scene is bathed in the languid atmosphere of "little ladies and gentlemen" seeking diversion on a summer day. Artists who miss the point that children require different clothes, take different attitudes, have a different relation to natural objects from adults, are like parents who do not know enough about children to give them different food. That people take pleasure in these pictures is an indication that they have no taste, or insight for child life. One feels that no true artist could interpret any form of life so falsely.[5] Not until childhood is understood by parents can we expect it to touch the imagination of artists. That

[5] For illustration see the portrait, otherwise beautiful, of Carlos, infant son of Philip IV, painted by Velasquez, and hung in the Boston Art Museum. The infant holds the royal scepter, and there is not a trace of childhood about him, save his tiny body, stiffened in its regal robe.

Christ pierced to the heart of the matter is the most valuable inheritance of the Christian religion, but one most disregarded.

"The spread of educational opportunity" might serve to counteract our widespread travesty of childhood, were it not for the fact that our taste in pleasure is of such vastly greater social significance than any formal educational movement can be. Still we must not overlook the lengthening of school attendance as a factor in safeguarding childhood. Instead of teaching a child a trade in the old efficient apprenticeship, we send him to a school where the majority of his energies will be expended in athletics, clubs, dramatics and social activities. Prestige in families is measured by the number of years a child can be kept out of "useful" occupation. In a thoughtful essay, Abraham Flexner [6] has suggested that the extension of school life, "means something more than mere democratic fairness. It means among other things, not that we value education, but that, as a people, we value the prolongation of youth," . . . "we hesitate to bring it to an early termination either by shunting boys and girls into deadening occupations or by subjecting them to serious intellectual effort. . . ."

To many educated, modern parents, the idea that the immaturity of childhood is the very basis of civilization, and that, in resisting its abrupt termination, they are fulfilling the conditions of the continued progress of mankind, comes as a fresh discovery.

That a child should learn self-help is highly de-

[6] Flexner, Abraham: "Do Americans Really Value Education?" The Inglis Lecture, 1927. Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., pp. 7-8.

sirable. When we see children of fussy, infantile parents throw off hampering adult assistance as they do in a Nursery School, learning, at the age of three, to carry pitchers of milk without spilling, walking on the top of a nine-foot Jungle Jim, mastering the complexities of buttoning and unbuttoning; when we see mere infants adjust to conditions in a detention home, or young children develop extraordinary composure in court when their parents have been led off to jail for bootlegging, or adultery, we realize that a human infant has powers, undreamed of, and untapped.

Still this is not the same thing as a deliberate encroachment on the right of a child to a prolonged immaturity.

Lack of comprehension of the value of infancy was excusable before we knew more about biology and the theory of evolution; to-day it is only fresh evidence of our absorption in adult self-interest. Ancient writers, while noting the hapless state of the human child in comparison with the offspring of animals, did not discover its real meaning. False theology augmented the indifference of science to a creature so inefficient, so lacking in reason and morals as the very young child. Space is not sufficient to treat this matter with any thoroughness, but all parents should familiarize themselves with the rudiments of the scientific outlook upon youth.

The lower animals and their parents are practically one, "with no immaturity and no need of education." Beginning with the ameba and ending with man, we note a constantly increasing scale of complexity of physical organization. In the human infant the formation of nerve-paths, the "integration of the nervous system" takes place largely after birth.

Man begins life "at the bottom of the ladder," and "crawls to maturity at a slower pace" than other animals because he has need of plasticity. His parents cannot abandon him in this helpless state; hence they must stay together, no matter how alluring the call of the jungle, or its modern substitute.

From this humble beginning all sociability and morality take their origin. A prolonged youth is thus the best guarantee of the further development of mankind.[7]

Low and dangerous ideals of play.

"Parents are for some time the natural playmates of their offspring," as Groos tells us, and play with children has a strong attraction for almost every normal adult. One of the disadvantages of our mechanical inventions is that play in the open air, "plays that set the muscles in motion, plays that incite emulation and courage, that act in compensatory fashion upon the nervous system, . . . play that makes the child bold, magnanimous, courteous to his fellows, and ingenious" is increasingly difficult. The home is too small, or too shoddily built, the routine of parents too exhausting, the outdoor space too restricted in modern cities to permit this kind of creative play. Hence we find commercialized recreation, which, to be profitable, must be of the nerve-shocking variety as in amusement parks and "concessions," or a rapid substitute for emotional experience, as in the dance-hall or movie. In modern play something is *done to* us. The body and

[7] Fiske, John: "Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy, Based upon the Doctrine of Evolution." First published London, 1874. To Fiske is still given the credit for pointing out the significance of youth in the evolution of humanity, although it was anticipated by others.

mind are inert while they endure the impact. What this does to the sensitive organism of the child has been pointed out by many observers. It makes us smile to read that as early as 1896[8] psychologists were protesting against the effect of modern theatrical representation: "With the whole billowing sea of human passions rushing upon them at once, when robbed of their rightful sleep, and overwhelming them with a flood of new and hurtful sensations—the effect upon young children cannot be other than bad, and the old puppet shows, once so suited to little children, have taken on a solemn ultra-childhood aspect." The most exciting of these old plays would to-day hardly keep a child awake.

Sixty thousand children under twelve each week attend the movies in Los Angeles.[9] The ratio is doubtless the same in every American city. The movies has become a sort of day-and-night nursery. Older brothers and sisters do their best to mind the baby under these new conditions.

A child of two and a half was crying so loudly that the manager sent some one to attend to it. His sister, aged ten, held the infant on her lap and had provided a lolly-pop, which, however, had failed to calm him; he was frightened at the screen-comedy. The little girl was exercising an immediate, drastic censorship. She would push the baby's head down and up, saying: "Don't look; now look; don't look," etc.

Some people who fail to understand the meaning of play object to our modern amusements on the ground they are not cultural; they appear to believe if the children attended symphonies and "spoken"

[8] Ferriani, L.: "Minderjährige Verbrecher." Berlin, 1896.
[9] Study by Mrs. Gladys Moulton.

drama all would be well. But there would still be an emotion aroused, and nothing to do about it, granted the production was capable of awakening emotion in the child. Our need is not for better things to see and listen to, but a form of play in which child and adult can participate.

Our present enslavement to passive or mechanical "recreation" is due to our inexperience. We have not yet learned to make a full humanized use of our inventions. The difficulty is not in the automobile, radio, or movie, but in the ideas of the persons who use them. Modern parenthood cannot be successful where children are subjected to low ideals of play. Ineptitude and brutality follow leisure spent without imagination; it is not so much that our parents and children are taken away from home as that they return home drained of creative energy. Nothing is more depressing than the satiety of young people who have "exerted" themselves for a good time, and in so doing have quenched the fire of enthusiasm without which no family group can survive.

Exhaustion of modern parents.

The ills which philosophers predict seldom come about. Herbert Spencer believed that, when education was provided free, parents would be deprived of their chief incentive to labor. On the contrary, we have produced a race of parents who work harder than any the world has ever seen, and, because of this preoccupation, parenthood faces new ills. One of them is unemployment. Parents are not prepared for unexpected hours which suddenly force them to spend more time with their children.

A boy who was antagonistic to his father said the trouble began when the father was laid off from

work. He interfered with everything, spanked the youngsters, complained all day: "I didn't know how mean he could be until he stayed home."

Two factors were operating to break up this relationship: the chronic exhaustion of the father in his daily job, and his lack of training and preparation for free time.[10]

If parents cannot meet these problems, it is better that they ignore their children more. The art of parenthood cannot be practiced by those who have exhausted their freshness and virility.

Some parents proceed on the theory that the child is like a garden, to be cultivated in off-hours for one's own refreshment; they expect him to stand still between their spasmodic acts of parenthood. If it is inevitable that parents exhaust themselves daily, they must remember that the child must find substitutes for parents elsewhere.

Our failure to eliminate cruelty to children.

A world which cannot eliminate war and crime cannot be expected to concern itself with the anguish misfit children suffer in schools and institutions. To those who see no wrong in corporal punishment in their own homes, there is nothing shocking in the fact that it is administered in public schools. However, an increasing number of parents and experts are convinced that it is a survival of barbarism. (Not savagery, for among primitive peoples young children are almost uniformly treated with kindness.)

Unfortunately, those who are over-much interested in the prevention of cruelty are animated by

[10] Van Waters, Miriam: "Concerning Parents." Republic Publishing Company. New York, 1926.

motives akin to cruelty. Most of us become interested only when the case is dramatic.

In a school, in a poor neighborhood, where every day some child was whipped, a little Russian girl of six was found by the attendance officer loitering on the playground. She said she was looking for her shoes. As she refused to go to the school room (she feared a whipping for being late), he carried her in. The teacher, on noting her excited state, decided not to whip her, but the child became so hysterical that she locked her into the closet. Later it was "necessary" to whip her after all. The child went home and died the next day, from a "ruptured heart."

The teacher was exonerated. How could she have known the child had heart disease? And the whipping was standard, a "humane" whipping.

People were shocked at this occurrence. But it would have seemed sentimental for them to protest against the daily practice of the school.

An institution, under religious management, shaves the heads of the boys who run away. Another does not give the children medical attention because it might "soften them." Two boys of twelve and thirteen were given "suspended sentences" to a reformatory for stealing two bottles of milk valued at nineteen cents each. A boy of eleven broke a window in a grocery store, was held in jail, and put through the process of finger printing. When some woman protested, the policeman wrote:

"There was no intention of humiliating any one. I was very kind to the boy during the process of taking his photograph and finger-prints, and tried to explain to him that if he continued going into stores the prints and pictures would help the police to get

him in jail. This talk seemed to convince him, and he said: 'No more for me.' "

Nothing is more needed than a revision of public opinion concerning cruelty to children.

The task of the parent may be nullified by a social order which judges the child in terms of the adult.

After more than a quarter of a century of Juvenile Courts, child offenders are still regarded and treated as adults. Recently an account of a commission of foremost men and women, called by the British government to make a survey concerning juvenile delinquents, recommended that the age of criminal responsibility be increased from seven to eight.[11]

The state of Massachusetts has just passed a law making it illegal to hold children under fourteen in jail, and requiring that those detained shall not be confined with adult criminals.[12]

Not only are there frequent violations of the laws we have protecting children from being debauched by association with adult criminals, but the laws themselves are inadequate in most states. Until we make a thoroughgoing change in our attitude toward child offenders in homes, schools and community, we are not going to have successful parenthood. The parents' reaction is likely to be that of

[11] Report of the Department Committee on the Treatment of Young Offenders, London, March, 1927, p. 21. "The age of seven was adopted hundreds of years ago and the whole attitude of society toward offenses committed by children has since been revolutionized. We think the time has come for raising the age of criminal responsibility, and we think it could safely be placed at eight."

[12] Bateman Bill, March 27th, 1927. This state had laws regulating detention of minors in jail before this date. But the fact that this particular law was deemed necessary is significant. One probation officer said it would be impossible to carry on the work of the court with such a law.

the mother who was telephoned that her small boy had been caught in an orchard, and the neighbor had sent for the patrol wagon:

"Had I known he was to go before the judge, I would have put a clean shirt on him."

What else could she do?

The fact is that not only are the principles under which the Juvenile Court was founded,—that the child should be treated, in care, custody and discipline, as nearly as possible as he should have been treated by his parents, and that there should be no taint of criminal procedure,—impossible to apply in a social order which has not grasped the idea, but that parents everywhere contribute to the state's mishandling of children by their own persistence in applying adult standards of conduct to child offenders.

Our wrong attitude toward sex and family formation.

Among obstacles to successful parenthood must be counted two current harmful attitudes toward sex. So frequently have these been pointed out that it seems an impertinence to do it again. However, they come to the fore in almost every case of children in court for sex offenses; and those in the room, parents, witnesses and social workers, appear to be divided into two camps. One may be described as the prosecution.

Into this camp come all those who feel that a sexual experience, unsanctioned by the state, is a crime. Some guilty one must be found; having found him, or her, the partner must be carefully scrutinized for signs of an accomplice. In states where laws regulating "age of consent" have been

established, the young girl must be presumed incapable of consenting to her seduction. Nevertheless there is strong moral feeling against her. In one state girls who have been "outraged" by father, step-father, brother, uncle or lodger in the home, are first brought before the court as "neglected" children, where their testimony becomes the foundation of a criminal charge against the man; then there is a second hearing where the girl is charged with "fornication." This word, with its etymological implications of idolatry and its long usage in ecclesiastical canon seems a strange one to apply to a little girl's experience, which unless we make it so, cannot have left much stain.

Into the other camp come those interested in the "defense." Leaving out those who share the idea of guilt, and are trying to save a particular person by blackening the reputation of somebody else, we note there are many who think it "does not matter." They are afraid to confront the formidable legal tradition openly, they are ashamed to face respectable social opinion, and say that illicit sexual experience is harmless for children. But they are convinced it is natural and would be glad to see all regulation cease.

From the point of view of human welfare, both camps, the rigid believers in ruin, and the cynic, the jester, and the indifferent are pernicious. Sexual experience is so much more than biological; its consequences to human beings go to the roots of our social and religious life. We cannot disregard them. Hence we can be sure that no child is unharmed by premature, or promiscuous sex-relations. We have added to the harm by an emotional attitude built up of ancient property rights in virginity, by fear,

superstition and obscenity. When we deal with a young person we may clear these away, and still recognize that something has happened which will require all our wisdom and skill to mend.

Parents cannot create public respect for parenthood, cannot assist in the formation of a durable family concept until they win for themselves the right attitude toward sex.[13]

The widening of the "primary group."

We have a false idea that because every one on a given day is talking about the same murder, or sporting exploit, that the civilized world is one neighborhood. In one sense it is true. The Polish term *okolica,* "the neighborhood round about," "as far as the report of a man reaches," [14] would to-day cover the remotest corner into which a newspaper is flung. But our response to what we hear is so different that we are more divided than ever. We know less and less about our immediate neighborhoods, even our own families. In short, our primary groups have become almost extinct.

"Primary groups" are "those societies which through kinship, isolation, voluntary adhesion to certain systems of definitions, secure an emotional unanimity among their members." [15]

[13] Emory, E. Van Norman, M.D., Director Child Guidance Clinic of Los Angeles: "Revising Our Attitude Toward Sex. Modern Parenthood: Proceedings of the Southern California Conference." Wolfer Printing Company. Los Angeles, 1927, pp. 253-271.

[14] W. I. Thomas.

[15] Thomas, W. I.: "The Persistence of Primary-Group Norms in Present-Day Society and Their Influence in Our Educational System." Printed in "Suggestions of Modern Science Concerning Education." Macmillan Company. New York, 1918, p. 171.

To-day few families can boast of "an emotional unanimity"; no neighborhood is well enough informed of the actions of the individuals who compose it to secure "voluntary adhesion" to certain standards. We live in dense pockets of ignorance. Hence we can no longer control the lives of our children, relatives and friends. This adds to parenthood the difficult task of making sure that their ideals are clear, worthy of imitation, and deeply appealing.

The impermanence of modern homes and the destruction of natural loveliness.

Homes appear indispensable to family life. Perhaps this is an immature stage. Possibly we shall outgrow the need we share with animals and savages for a dear nest, a cozy snuggling place. With our human dependence on material supports for our relationships, it is difficult to see how we shall get along in apartment houses as substitutes for homes. Already many families have dispensed with hearths and gardens. Love is bound up so symbolically with old furniture, clocks, three-legged kitchen stools, and sprigged wild flowers upon dishes, that it is hard for us to foresee what will gladden the heart, and free it of malice, ill-will and petulance when the modern child knows none of these things. Perhaps his affection will cleave as well to disappearing beds and gas radiators, but we doubt it.

How hideousness of environment affects family life we cannot say. That unbeautiful homes, wretched architecture, go hand in hand with cheapened or degraded family relationships we cannot deny.

"The greatest economic loss of our time is in the

90 per cent of bad building that we allow to go up in our cities. There is little or no excuse for it. Building inspectors in practically all the large cities will give you estimates, varying, at most, a few per cent, that only about 10 per cent of the plans for buildings built to-day are prepared by trained architects or others with any competency in design.[16]

Indifference to parenthood is the cause rather than the effect of the ugliness and transitory quality seen in our modern dwellings. People who care for children express it in architecture where children can be happy, and a cat and dog may settle down.

Impermanence is a torture to children. How many modern children live through real tragedy when "progress" sweeps away their homes! Destruction of forests and orchards, and fields of wild flowers, carries with it an amount of suffering that has never been realized because persons who love these things are not articulate. A little boy of five was taken by his parents to a field that had been overlooked by subdividers; hence acres of yellow poppies caught the sun in their cups. The child ran about crying: "Papa—poppies, poppies, poppies." Will there be any fields of wild flowers for the five-year-olds of next generation? When we see an iron scraper bite into a hillside, making a mudhole of the brook, scooping up maiden-hair ferns, we feel that the modern world has invented a destructiveness that stops short of nothing.

All that we can do will not protect children and other sensitive folk from the misery incident to mere progress. Bojer, in "The Last of the Vik-

[16] Cheney, Charles H.: "Architectural Control of Private Property." National Conference on City Planning. 130 E. 22nd St., New York, 1927.

ings," tells us how it feels to a boy to see all the open sail-boats driven off the sea by motor-power boats. To deprive us gradually of object after object, endeared not only by familiar emotions but intrinsic loveliness, is the "necessary" trend of the times. Parents, to be successful, must recapture these things. Their psychological counterpart may be secured, even when we have lost them actually. A battered Ford, plastered with slogans, may mean as much to present-day young people as the stage-coach or the sail-boat. Children will invest with meaning the most utilitarian mechanical invention. . . . National forest reservations, city parks, if left sufficiently natural, will one day prove substitutes for our lost heritage. But parents must make them available to their children, and communities which now raise money for countless conventions of business men, clubs, Elks, Shriners, et cetera, must do the like for children and send them to the few wild spots we have permitted to survive.[17]

The task of the modern city parent is to make himself aware of the results of depriving children of things the race has found essential, the enjoyment of flowers, trees, water, earth, rocks; ships, vehicles that require human manipulation, toys that can be loved, and a home to store them in. That some cities are beginning to plan imaginatively for homes is a sign that it is possible, by collective action, to remove one of our present greatest obstacles to parenthood —the lack of a suitable dwelling.

[17] The City Playground Department of Los Angeles has camps in the San Bernardino Mountains, and in the High Sierra Mountains hundreds of miles away from the city where families go each year at a mere fraction of the cost of individual vacations. The city of Toronto pays carfare for all school children to the lake-front during the summer months.

CHAPTER VI

WHO IS THE LEGAL OWNER OF THIS CHILD?

Studies from child custody cases.

CUSTODY conflicts concerning children outweigh in bitterness and grief any other form of litigation. They present a ready-made laboratory in which are focused all the views of childhood and family life. The opinions of parents, relatives, lawyers, teachers, doctors, social workers, churchmen, neighbors, exhibit themselves against the frame-work of the law, which in itself is a fossilized tracing of opinions held anciently by other citizens, parents, lawyers, et cetera.

The legal background of custody conflicts in old English common law.

Children are not mentioned in the constitution of the United States, nor in those of the majority of the separate states. The parent-child relationship, however, in the common law has been discussed with minuteness.

Blackstone[1] considers the matter under the following headings: (1) The legal duties of parents to their legitimate children. (2) Their power over them. (3) The duties of such children to their parents.

[1] Blackstone, Sir W.: "Commentaries on the Laws of England." Edition by Christian, Archbald & Chitty. Published by Collins & Hannay. New York, 1830. Chapter on Parent and Child, pp. 355-368.

Maintenance of children by parents is declared to be a *natural* law: "For they would be in the highest manner injurious to their issue, if they only gave their children life, that they might afterwards see them perish." Although all well-regulated states have taken care to enforce this duty, Providence has seen fit to safeguard it "by implanting in the heart of every parent that natural στοργη, or insuperable degree of affection, which not even the deformity of person or mind, not even the wickedness, ingratitude, and rebellion of children can totally suppress or extinguish."

Alas for Blackstone, did he sit in the Juvenile Court to-day, how frequently would he be shocked at the waning of this same parental affection, implanted by Providence. Nor could he take refuge in the depravity of children, for the court psychologist would point out to him that that also was attributable to a parental fault.

Blackstone, too, seemed to have misgivings, and to find conditions which modified the sacred instinct, for he notes that with "bastard" children: "The rights are very few, being such only as he can *acquire*," for "bastards are not looked upon as children to any civil purposes," . . . "whereas in promiscuous and illicit conjunctions, the father is unknown; and the mother finds a thousand obstacles in her way;—shame, remorse, the constraint of her sex, and the rigor of laws:—that stifle her inclinations to perform this duty, and besides she generally wants ability."

Again, he finds that "nothing is so apt to stifle the calls of nature as religious bigotry," citing with satisfaction the enactment of an English law whereby if "any popish parent shall refuse to allow his Prot-

estant child a fitting maintenance, with a view to compel him to change his religion, the lord chancellor shall by order of court constrain him to do what is just and reasonable." In the very next year, however, a follower of "another religion, of no less bitterness and bigotry than the popish," a Jew, of "immense riches, whose only daughter having embraced Christianity he turned her out of doors; and on her application for relief, it was held she was entitled to none"; so this gave occasion to the passing of another law: "which ordains, that if Jewish parents refuse to allow their Protestant children a fitting maintenance suitable to the fortune of the parent, the lord chancellor on complaint, may make such order therein as he shall see proper."

The duty of protection.

This duty, flowing out of maintenance, is also a *natural* one, permitted rather than enjoined, and needing a check rather than a spur. The common law justified assault and battery in defense of the person of children, and Blackstone notes that where a man's son was beaten by another boy, and the father went a mile to find him to give him a beating of which he unfortunately died, it was held to be manslaughter, not murder. The law is extraordinarily tender, not so much of human frailty, as of a parental affection that shows pugnacity.

In Juvenile Court to-day we note that any one who lays hands on the child of another arouses the bitterest resentment of the neighbors. A boy of seven, who was frequently beaten black and blue by his parents, threw rocks at the new automobile of a girl of sixteen, breaking a window. She descended from her car and held his wrists until her father came.

For this act of violence she was brought before the Juvenile Court and had difficulty in escaping being assaulted by the parents of the boy.

To conjugal difficulties, however, the law is not so lenient. A mother in a modern municipal court filed a battery action against her husband, alleging that he had beaten their daughter. When the judge found that the blow was aimed at the mother, and the little girl got hit because she flung herself in the way, the judge said: "This is no child battery," and dismissed the case.

The duty of education.

This duty of parents toward children, though "pointed out by reason," has been indifferently provided for in municipal law until modern times, perhaps because, as suggested by Blackstone, it was thought "punishment enough to leave the parent who neglects the instruction of his family to labor under those griefs and inconveniences which his family, so uninstructed, will be sure to bring upon him." Formerly laws concerning education were for the "poor and laborious part of the community," which provided for apprenticing children, so they could be taught a trade, suitable to their position, while the "rich indeed are left at their own option, whether they will breed up their children to be ornaments or disgraces to their family." The only restriction was in matters of religion, for if any person would send his child beyond the seas, "either to prevent its good education in England, or in order to enter into or reside in any popish college," . . . "the person both sending and sent shall be disabled to sue in law or equity . . . or to enjoy any legacy or deed of gift, or to bear any office in the realm, and shall

forfeit all his goods and chattels, and likewise of all his real estate for life."

To-day we note that there is "such a diversity of religious and social opinion and of social standing and of intellectual development and of moral responsibility in society at large that courts must exercise great charity and forbearance for the opinions, methods and practices of all different classes of society; and a case should be made out which is sufficiently extravagant and singular and wrong to meet the condemnation of all decent and law-abiding people without regard to religious belief or social standing before a parent should be deprived of the comfort or custody of a child." [2]

It is recognized that it is the father's duty to guard his child's welfare and morals: "If the father hires out his son to one who compels him to work on Sunday," the father may take home his son, and cancel the contract, "even though the child did not object to Sunday labor."

Our boards of education have modified by statute the father's supreme control over education. The school authorities prescribe courses and textbooks, grade and classify the children, but the father still has the right to "select from the courses provided those which his child is to pursue." The modern parent, however, submits with a surprising supineness to the dictation of the community with regard to education. But we must remember that the vast power of the school is derived from parents; teachers merely stand *in loco parentis.*

[2] Ruling case Law Decisions and Quotations continued in Lawyers' Reports annotated. American Decisions, American State Reports, English Ruling Cases, United States Supreme Court Reports. Published Rochester, N. Y., 1918, p. 595 *et seq.*

The power of parents over their children.

The ancient law gave large authority to parents, "partly to enable the parent more effectually to perform his duty, and partly as a recompense for his care and trouble in the faithful discharge of it." The Roman law gave the power of life and death to the father, though this was softened later, the emperor Hadrian banishing a father for killing his son, though he had committed a "heinous crime"; still no son, under Roman law, could acquire property during the life of his father, and all his earnings belonged to the parent, as long as he lived.

The English law was more moderate. It terminated the father's power when the children reached twenty-one, and gave him only the authority "necessary to keep the child in order and obedience," during minority.

If the father conducts himself improperly, "as being in constant habits of drunkenness or blasphemy, or attempting to mislead him in matters of religion, or to take him improperly out of the kingdom," the father may be compelled to give security, or the child may be removed from his custody.

Recognition of the power of the mother is a late acquisition, "for a mother as such," in common law, "is entitled to no power, but only to reverence and respect." The rights of the mother came to be recognized only as the welfare of the child gained in importance. To-day we find in many states a similar civil code enactment to the one in California:[3] "The husband and father, as such has no rights superior to those of the wife and mother, in regard to the care, custody and education and control of the children of the marriage, while such hus-

[3] Civil Code of California, No. 198, enacted March 21, 1872.

band and wife live separate and apart from each other."

The principle of child welfare entered the law at the same time as the enactment of these codes. We find it definitely stated that the right of a parent "is not an absolute right, and cannot be dealt with as if it were a property right, but it is rather in the nature of a trust imposed on the (parent) for the child's benefit." In matters of custody the judge is empowered to use his discretion, in order that the *best interests of the child may be served.*

Hence the principle has arisen that the judge must weigh the matter in terms of child welfare.

"The abuse of parental authority is the subject of judicial cognizance in a civil action brought by the child, or by its relative within the third degree, or by the supervisors of the county where the child resides; and, when the abuse is established, the child may be freed from the dominion of the parent, and the duty of support and education enforced." [4]

Cruelty or neglect are commonly held to warrant forfeiture of custody. Failure to provide medical attention has been held to justify the appointment of a guardian to replace the father. However, the English showed their conservatism, as late as 1833, by the declaration of the court of appeals that the court would not interfere on the ground of cruelty, "except in utmost need and in the most extreme case."

In America the court must be solicitous for the welfare of the child in deciding any case of custody.

"The court shall proceed to hear and dispose of the case, after full and careful consideration of all

[4] California Civil Code, No. 203: based on Field's Draft of the New York Civil Code. Section 94.

the evidence presented and with due regard to the legitimate rights and claims of the parent or parents of said person and with due regard to any and all ties of blood or affection, but with the *dominant purpose of serving the best interests of the child.*" [5]

How far we have traveled in the direction of viewing the child as a person may be seen from the following:

"Rules for awarding custody of minor: In awarding the custody of a minor, or in appointing a general guardian, the court is to be guided by the following considerations:

"By what appears to be for the best interest of the child in respect to its temporal and its mental and moral welfare; and if the child is of sufficient age to form an intelligent preference, the court may consider that preference in determining the question." [6]

To insure this principle it is necessary to have the mother's right written definitely into the code: "The father and mother of a legitimate unmarried minor child are equally entitled to its custody, services and earnings." [7]

Our courts have also seen fit to declare in no uncertain terms that the parent has no *property right* in the child:

"A father has no property right in a child, and a claim that he was deprived of his property without due process of law and without compensation, in violation of the Constitution of the United States, Amendment 14, in that by losing its custody in divorce proceedings where he was not personally served with process he was deprived of its services,

[5] Section 15: of the Juvenile Court Act of California.
[6] California Civil Code. Section 206.
[7] California Civil Code. Section 197.

cannot be considered, although a parent is entitled to damages for value of services of a child unlawfully restrained or injured, and is also entitled to the child's earnings, but cannot compel it to do service for another." [8]

The duties of children to their parents.

Blackstone holds that these duties "arise from a principle of natural justice and retribution." The legitimate child must provide for the parent, if he falls into poverty, no matter how badly he has behaved. The Athenians made an exception, and freed children from the duty of support, "whose chastity has been prostituted by consent of the father, and those whom he had not put in any way of gaining a livelihood."

The English laws stated that the "tie of nature" is not "dissolved by any misbehavior of the parent; and therefore a child is equally justifiable in defending the person, or maintaining the cause or suit of a bad parent, as a good one; and is equally compellable, if of sufficient ability, to maintain and provide for a wicked and unnatural progenitor, as for one who has shewn the greatest tenderness and parental piety." [9]

The modern Juvenile Court finds the emphasis of public opinion all the other way. The most pious

[8] Kenner vs. Kenner: 139 Tenn. 700. Sept., 1917.

[9] For an excellent discussion of Mexican code provisions for family life, showing how simply and beautifully the Mexicans have arranged for the matters which seem to be such stumbling blocks to Anglo-Saxons: *see* Shontz, Orfa Jean: "The Land of Poco Tiempo: A Study in Mexican Family Relationships in a Changing Social Environment." Paper read at a meeting of the American Sociological Society, St. Louis, Dec. 30, 1926. Published in *The Family,* 130 E. 22nd St., New York. Vol. VII, No. 3, May, 1927. pp. 74-79.

parent would not dream that his child should support him. When he seeks custody to-day it is for emotional, rather than economic satisfaction.

Case I. Andrew is thirteen, Agnes is fifteen. A family welfare worker filed a petition to have them made wards of the court and placed in the custody of the mother. The children wished to go to their father, who lived on a ranch with his second wife. The parents had lived together four years; then the father had deserted. He had never become reconciled to the birth of Andrew. He had scowled when he saw him, as if he had seen "some horrible thing, like a snake." The mother had then decided "it would be criminal to bring any more babies into the world by him." The mother supported herself and the children; she placed them in boarding homes and worked as cook in various families. For six years the whereabouts of the father were unknown; then he returned to claim his share of his father's estate, without seeing his children, or allotting them a portion. With the money he secured a divorce, a ranch, and a new wife.

His young plum trees were just beginning to bear when it occurred to him that he would send for his children. He wrote a letter to Miss Y, who was boarding them. Miss Y. was a spinster and went to the United Brethren Church. The children's mother was Catholic, but as Miss Y. considered that faith wrong, she sent the children to her church. The father too was a Protestant.

He explained that the children could continue to go to the right church. He painted in glowing terms the freedom of the ranch, the new stucco high school, where they could "finish their education," the kind-

ness of the woman whom he had married. He ended with an appeal to Miss Y. to understand a man's feelings and to use her influence.

Miss Y. was flattered. She had been having difficulties with the mother, who was now planning to establish a little home of her own, and who wished to take the children.

Agnes said at once she wished to go. While she loved her mother, who was a great nagger, constantly complaining of ailments, over-work, ingratitude of children, and the infidelity of her husband, Agnes thought it would be thrilling to find a "new" father. Andrew at first stood up for his mother; then he echoed Agnes. That evening when the mother called, the children were cool and impertinent. The mother met the situation with floods of tears. She maintained that she had been a good mother, no one could be better, yet the children had turned against her. She admitted that she had punished Andrew severely, but she did not want him to grow up to be such a "terrible and cruel man as his father." She marveled that now she was in the position to care for them they did not wish to remain.

At the end of six months, conditions became unbearable. The social worker thought the children should be placed in a reformatory for disobedience. The worker from the Catholic Charities thought that for these children to go to a Protestant, abandoning father would be illegal and immoral. The school teacher said they ought to go; it was monstrous to think that, at sixteen, they would have to go to work and help support the mother; they were very intelligent and ought to finish high school. The United Brethren preacher said the father ought to be forgiven, and it was natural for half-grown children to

need a father. The neighbors said the mother was more to blame than the father, for she was a bad housekeeper, and drove him away by slovenliness, bad temper and jealousy. A paternal aunt stated that her people sided with the mother, they had broken with their brother, considering his desertion inexcusable; besides, he had been mean about the estate, and they did not believe he was really married to his present wife.

The father came of a large family, in which the family ties are light. His father was a fine old man, but his children tried to have him declared insane, so they could have his property. It was discovered that Agnes' and Andrew's father was the only one who stood by him, and for that reason none of the others would at present have anything to do with him. His own mother "kicked him out of the house when he was twelve." He went then to live on a cattle ranch, owned by an uncle, and for many years associated with cowboys, and "took on their wild ways."

Miss Y. was the only serene person. She displayed the utmost tolerance, while fanning the flames, and repeating little things that were said. For the first time in her life she was receiving, regularly, letters from an appealing, helpless male.

Andrew and Agnes began to fail at school. They grew pale and irritable. They argued constantly about religion. Their attitude toward their mother oscillated between violent outbursts of affection and aversion.

The father's lawyer said the mother was vindictive, stood in the children's way, and was merely trying to hold up social workers for more funds whereby she could stay at home to be supported by

charity and her helpless offspring. The mother's lawyer said the father was an inhuman brute who now wished to gain possession of his daughter, probably for immoral purposes.

By the time the case reached the court, two young people had turned from happy children into skilled casuists, filled with suspicion, recrimination, anxiety and hatred.

Shall we say the mother, because of her devotion and hard labor, had the prior right, even though she had had to appeal to "charity" and could not educate her children, and in fact herself had destroyed their affection? Shall we say the father should take the children because he had rehabilitated his home and could provide a better life for them? Or shall we merely try to decide what is for the children's welfare? Who is competent to decide?

These parents have succeeded in placing an insoluble problem before the community.

Formerly, under ancient law, the father would have sent for the children when he felt minded and the mother would have acquiesced submissively, consoling herself with the thought they would still owe her "reverence and respect." To-day, when there is little or no thought of owing anybody anything, but where the superior court itself is concerned with *feelings,* even mentioning the *preference* of the children, we are in confusion.

As Dr. William White has said: "No conflict can be solved at the level of the conflict." So not until the children moved up a notch could anything be done about it.

Agnes fell in love. This caused the social worker consternation, because the youth was "undesirable." It gave the court the opportunity to point out to

Agnes that she was growing up, new definitions of happiness were possible, she need not cleave to either parent. Agnes saw the advantages of this viewpoint, went into a new foster home cheerfully, took an indulgent attitude toward the claims of both parents, recovered her lost standing in school and her sunny disposition. Andrew hated to give up the idea of the ranch, but for so many years his view of happiness had been bound up with what Agnes thought that he found his happiness vicariously.

Case II. Lucile is six and a ward of the Court. She is at home with her maternal grandmother. Her mother, Mrs. Gissing, is twenty-six, slim, well-dressed, earning a good living selling automobiles. Her employer is forty-five. They take week-end trips together. She insists they are not lovers. His wife and grown-up daughter visit her, and feel sorry for her because she has such an "impossible" mother. Since the court took Lucile away, the daughter has been staying with her, as a cure for loneliness.

Probably the court would not have insisted on Lucile's departure had the child not shown such aversion to her mother's employer and such indifference to the mother herself. Lucile stated the case in her own words:

"At first we lived with my grandmother and my Aunt Martha. Mother worked and supported all of us, and was *perfectly happy* until she met Mr. X. Then she and my grandmother quarreled and my mother took me and went to live by ourselves. Mr. X. came every day to our house. I hate him. The only spanking I ever got was because I wouldn't kiss him."

Lucile is a pert child. She handles her doll as if

it were an accessory to her costume. Although exceedingly precocious, she is still a baby, lisping affectedly, wetting the bed at night, flying into temper-tantrums when crossed. She is pale, eats only what pleases her, stays up until all hours, and had always slept with the grandmother.

The court suggests to Mrs. Gissing that she arrange matters with her employer so that she sees him only in business hours. Mrs. Gissing answers:

"That is not the trouble. My mother and sister have put Lucile up to saying that. I have been dominated long enough by my mother. I have supported her since I was sixteen; now I am going to have a home of my own."

"Where is Lucile's father?" asks the Court. The grandmother, without an instant's hesitation, without giving the court opportunity to send the little girl out of the room, says: "We don't know. She was never married to him anyway. Lucile is a love-child."

The court room is then so still that it is as if an explosion had shattered the building, leaving its framework naked to the sky. The court officer silently removes the child.

Mrs. Gissing says: "This is the woman who pretends she loves this child. I am not bothered for myself. But could any one who loves do this to a child? The time will come when they will throw her birth up to her, and, suggesting she has certain tendencies, like me, treat her accordingly."

Endless and hot waged this battle between mother and grandmother, aunt and witnesses. Then the court sent them all out, and, drawing Lucile close, tried to persuade her to go home with her mother. Lucile's eyes held the same expression as her mother

when she confronted *her* mother. The court "ended" the matter by ordering Lucile to go home and behave herself. (The mother and Mr. X. were told to behave too.) Lucile threw herself on the floor in a spasm of rage, but was carried home bodily.

Later, however, the probation officer found Lucile very unhappy. Mrs. Gissing had not been able to make good her claim that the child would be all right. The probation officer reported that the mother fed her sensibly, obeyed the rules of child hygiene, was loving and thoughtful, that Mr. X. came only on to the porch, and that Lucile had improved in school and had stopped enuresis. She reported further that the grandmother's home was far from suitable. Lucile had been spoiled there.

The grandmother was a good-looking woman of forty-seven. She had had four children; her husband had died when the youngest was ten. She had always belittled him before the neighbors. It was true he bore responsibility lightly; but her fault-finding had been constant. The only objects she "really loved" were the youngest son, whose death during the World War had been such a shock to her that her grief became morbid, and Lucile, of whom she was so fond that she resented the interest the child's mother took, ridiculing her affection, and seeking in various ways to alienate it. Before the son's death there had been frequent family quarrels. He had questionable friends, and "low morals," but the rest of the family were made to accept him as the favorite. The oldest son was stingy. There was a question about his honesty and he had recently lost a good job. He was most anxious for a reconciliation between his mother and Mrs. Gissing, lest he

have to support his mother. Upon two occasions he had thrown her out of the house, refusing support. He interpreted his sister's desire to have the custody of Lucile as another evidence of the "stubbornness" she had shown since childhood.

The oldest girl, Aunt Martha, was a "roamer"; she had a concession at one of the beaches, derived a good income, but was unstable. Her one passion in life was Lucile. She resented bitterly the court's attempt to make Lucile happy with her mother. She had violent outbursts of temper, during which she used bad language, but Lucile could always subdue her, by crying. She would make large sums of money, lavishing gifts on every one, then become moody, for days at a time, and do nothing. Physically Lucile resembled her aunt, and there was a subtle bond of sympathy between them. The aunt was the only one in the family who could remember the things the social worker wished to know, at what age the child walked and talked, and how many illnesses she had had, et cetera.

Mrs. Gissing appeared quite different from the other members of the family. She loved reading, hated quarreling and nagging, cherished ideals of her father's memory, was undoubtedly efficient about making money, and was capable of following a program for Lucile's welfare. However, Mr. X. exercised over her a fascination which it was impossible to describe. Without him she seemed aimless. In his company she was self-assured and vivacious.

Weighing all the evidence, the probation officer recommended that Lucile be returned to the home of her grandmother. Though physically better, she was developing great bitterness against her mother. She said to the probation officer: "Mother wants

me because she doesn't want Grandmother and Aunt Martha to have the pleasure of having me." The child became increasingly jealous of Mr. X. Such antagonism in a little child was bound to turn out badly.

So the court returned Lucile to the home of the grandmother, where she continued to keep late hours, attending the movies, and where she heard constant incriminations of her mother, and ate chiefly sweets and potatoes and gravy.

Mrs. Gissing's "mother-love" was not strong enough to induce her to give up Mr. X. Apparently she needed him so deeply that her need for her child was secondary.

Whether he was "father" or lover to her we do not know. She could establish no legal relation to him because his wife objected on religious grounds to divorce. It began to be evident that she could not be happy without Lucile, either.

The court was not satisfied with its determination. Neither could it face the doubtful mothering of a foster home or institution for Lucile.

Three adult women were ready to mother her passionately, but not one loved enough to give up self-interest. Each claimed her as a kind of surety for her hold on life.

Solutions in a case of child custody are fated to be wrong. Their premises include so much that is unfit for a child to hear, that we can only trust to life, and to the wisdom of some supervising probation officer, who, at times, is able to bring the issue to a successful outcome, if only she can find some adult unselfish enough to submit to education.

Case III. Frank is now twelve. He is a tall, hardy boy who stands on the street corner after

school selling newspapers before his father's repair shop. In the rear is a bungalow, not very well kept. The paint on the porch has been scratched off by dogs. There is no grass in the front yard, the boys have tramped it out. Scrap iron, broken automobiles, tires and rubbish litter the place. Occasionally a large woman in a spotless pink muslin comes to the door and calls in a harsh voice, or she goes to the filling station and helps some one to gasoline. She is Frank's stepmother. She feeds her family well, slaps her stepson and her two children, aged ten and eight, with her heavy hands, keeps them in clean shirts daily. She is not a pleasant woman, but she has improved vastly in the last nine years.

Frank was three when he came before the court. His mother died in childbirth. His father had deserted her and she died forlornly in the hospital, not having the faintest idea whom "to give" Frank to. However the father's sister, a well-to-do widow, read of Frank's birth in the papers and presented herself to take him away. She kept him a year before his father saw him. Between this brother and sister was a great deal of bitterness. She had raised him, spoiled him, and turned him out of the house when he married. There was nothing he could do. He had failed in school, never learned a trade, had evaded the war-draft; at twenty-three he was an anemic, helpless, smirking, half-breathless individual, always making excuses. His sister threw on the floor a ten-dollar bill he gave her for Frank. She could find no words to express her indignation, so she did not tell him that he simply didn't exist as Frank's father. She thought it was evident to every one that she was Frank's sole parent. She devoted herself to the task of rearing him with an absorption that consumed her.

Frank was sickly. There were daily visits from the doctor. The child slept with her, and was hardly ever out of her arms. When he came to the court he lay there almost lifeless, dressed in a sheer white embroidered baby dress.

Frank's father filed the petition. It was the first positive act of his life. He hired a lawyer, said he was willing and able to care for his son, but his sister refused to let him. Her lawyer, an able and urbane gentleman, made short work of him. He pointed out the father's incompetence and neglect, the aunt's solicitude, but for which the child would have perished; it was unthinkable that so delicate a child could leave the tender care of this woman. The court agreed, but ordered the father to pay for support.

A year went by; the father paid nothing. When Frank was brought in again, the court was struck with the fact that although he was longer and heavier, he still wore baby clothes, and leaned his head against the breast of his aunt, and showed not the slightest inclination to grow up. The court physician and psychologist examined Frank. The court's "hunch" was right: there was really nothing the matter with this child. The aunt was asked to treat him a little less tenderly. She considered this such an impertinence that she summoned two lawyers and a score of representatives from women's organizations to appear at the next hearing.

Frank's father had committed an enormity. He had married a woman six years older, with a child, and he was supporting her, and doing very well. This woman had been divorced by her husband for cruelty. The court had awarded the husband the custody of their child, but the man had turned it

over to her and departed. She now appeared in the juvenile court and declared she was about to take Frank home also.

No one can imagine the horror this raised in the minds of all decent people. To turn over a frail immaculate child to this brute of a woman, and this sniveling father! But the Court decided on an experiment; the child was to go to the father for two weeks. There was tremendous outcry, and the referee found she had again committed "one of those crimes of the century," so frequent in custody cases which are decided against the opinion of the comfortable part of the community.

Frank, at the end of two weeks, walked into the court room, dressed in blue gingham rompers, and for the first time said "Hello" in answer to the court's greeting. To his aunt's outstretched arms he paid no attention, and walked outside with the probation officer to look at pictures in the little room where children wait while conflicts concerning them are raging.

The stepmother said triumphantly: "I made a man of *him,*" pointing to Frank's father, "now I can do the same for the son." "No—I won't hit him," she roared in answer to a remark muttered by the aunt's lawyer, "but I'll let him play with my kid in the dirt and I won't stand no nonsense from him." A shudder went through the witnesses.

Frank never went back to his aunt. The case was continued from time to time and fought with deadly intensity on both sides. At first the probation officer felt that although this was Frank's one chance to lead a normal childhood, the father's interest would wane when no longer fanned by the flames of litigation. She had misgivings too about the step-

mother. However, after six years of waiting, visiting, supervising and court reports every four months or so, it was evident that Frank was well enough off to be dismissed from the care of the Court.

The aunt has settled back into bitter, loveless, old age. But if the state, through the court, is to proceed as a "wise parent," how could it have entrusted to this woman a child to spoil, as she had spoiled its father, until he was saved by the vulgar vitality of his second wife. Of course we cannot be sure, but it seems that Frank was doomed in the aunt's hands to be the victim of her starvation, and that at best he would have been a physical and mental weakling. No one believed the father "deserved" to have Frank, but to-day even the members of women's clubs would have to admit that Frank is healthy, happy and well behaved.

Case IV. Mr. and Mrs. Anthony were divorced when Mary was six. Mrs. Anthony obtained the divorce on the ground of mental cruelty. Her husband did not contest it. Mary, their only child, was given to the custody of the mother. There was no dispute over the financial settlement; indeed, there could not have been, as Mrs. Anthony had supported herself and child, had put her husband through college, and maintained him in his long search for something genteel to do. She worked in a large banking establishment, but she had also worked as cook in hot little desert towns, living in one room, and sending almost every cent to her husband.

Four years after the divorce, Mr. Anthony, on one of his visits, found Mary alone in the apartment. Her mother had gone off for the week-end with friends. Mary told him she was lonely, and she

objected to her mother's friends. One man took mother out to dances, and kissed her when he brought her home. The father filed a petition.

Mary told the probation officer to let the court decide the matter, as she herself was uncertain. "If mother wasn't a married woman it would be all right to let a man kiss her, but my school teacher says it is awful. I don't know father very well, but I might go to live with Uncle Thomas."

Both parents agreed with Mary that the court should decide. They came with no lawyers. Mrs. Anthony's business firm had a reputation for employing only women of "character"; she feared she would lose her job. Mr. Anthony was studying for the ministry and feared publicity.

In the hearing, the father's relatives showed extraordinary hostility to Mrs. Anthony. An aunt pointed out that she was a "cold and unnatural mother" because she had bought a "baby-book" and followed it carefully in the rearing of Mary. It became apparent that they were conscious of intellectual and moral superiority over Mrs. Anthony, whose mother had been an Italian, and whose childhood had been one of hard labor and disorder. She was living with a girl friend and earning a good living when she met Mr. Anthony. To her he seemed "the most cultured man" she had ever known. After their marriage she discovered his leading emotion was moral indignation. She loved music, and gay little parties. He rebuked her sternly for wishing to go on a picnic when she was pregnant. She acquiesced in all his wishes until they were divorced.

Mrs. Anthony now admitted almost everything; she admitted going to dances and leaving Mary alone. She admitted a few occasional kisses, and

week-end trips. Empathically she denied "immorality." A woman from the bank sent word that by no means could she be brought into the case, but every one knew that Mrs. Anthony was all right. One thing bothered the court. Mary was underweight, frail and very shy. She had had a serious mastoid, and the doctor testified that it had resulted almost fatally because the mother had failed to bring the child for treatments.

"Why did you neglect the child's illness?"

"It was because she was taking dancing lessons," said a relative.

Mrs. Anthony broke into tears: "Yes, it is true. Oh, why didn't I dance when I was young? I have *never* had enough dancing."

The relatives all nodded, as if this remark was final proof she was an unfit mother.

The court decided to send Mary to her paternal uncle. He was a minister in the country. In many ways this decision was unwise. It gave the father's people a tremendous moral victory. They never permitted the mother to see the child alone. They treated her as a "scarlet woman." Mary gained in weight, but lost in other ways. She became more timid, and a look of hardness settled over her when she talked of her mother.

At Christmas the mother proposed taking the child to a lovely old inn in the mountains. The court gave permission. A delegation from the uncle's church, however, called on the probation officer to explain this was impossible—"who would know what would befall the child in a public place with that woman." When the officer explained it was with the court's sanction, the delegation presented a letter from Mary saying she did not wish to go,

also that she wished the court would not say her mother was to see her alone, for "I never wish again to be alone with mamma in all my life: it isn't safe for me."

A few months later Mrs. Anthony called at the office. She too had grown hard and timid: "If I should marry Mr. B., a very wealthy suitor, though I don't love him a bit, could I have Mary?" It was explained to her that matters now had grown very complex.

"When I first met Mr. Anthony, I thought it was too good to be true that a man of such a family would want to marry me: now I know this family is too good to be true, too good to live—I wish I were dead, and Mary too."

The next day the father called; "I think the matter is settled now. You might as well dismiss the case. It is a disgrace to have a flower-like child like Mary under the court. Her mother has no character. She hasn't even visited the child in three weeks. The name of Anthony is a proud old name and all who bear it are of solid, upright stock. This tragedy that has come into the life of one of the members" (squaring his shoulders) "is almost more than the family can bear."

The court did not dismiss the case, but it might just as well. Of what avail can the "protection" of the court be to a little girl of eleven who thinks it is not safe to be with her mother, and who lives a "flower-like" life among the ramparts of a "solid, upright stock?"

Case V. Men commonly do not affirm and uphold their fatherhood in face of vigorous denials, yet there are such men, men who marry women or seek

to marry them for the custody of a child, who may or may not be theirs.

Mr. G. was an engineer. He married a woman two years older with a boy of three. He put up with everything, atrocious temper, infidelity and extravagance so he could be near Jim. Neither Jim nor Mrs. G. paid the slightest attention to him. When the mother was deprived of custody, he supported the boy, and never remarried, because he felt that Jim would not like it.

Often the parental feeling of the unmarried father is in proportion strong as the feeling of the mother wanes. Often this appears linked to love and hate of the woman, that curious, wholly "natural" feeling to which psychiatrists have given the name "ambivalence." Occasionally however we find a genuine father-love unmixed by any desire, save for the welfare of the child.

Such a father was Mr. H. He met a young American girl who refused to marry him. After several months he found she was with child. She told him laughingly that it was, in all likelihood, not his, but he insisted it *might* be, and cajoled her into not having an abortion. The little girl was born in a private hospital. Mr. H. was overjoyed. He came to see it every day. When the mother was discovered signing relinquishment papers, he protested so vehemently that the authorities refused to let her complete them. When the mother disappeared, taking the child with her, he hired detectives, gave up his work and succeeded in bringing her back. He offered her an income of $150.00 a month if she would leave the child to him, of $250.00 if she would settle down and care for it. She refused both offers and led him a miserable life for four years, once

taking the child out of the state. He followed her, established residence, and had the child awarded to him, on the ground of her unfitness. Then she "kidnaped" the child, and he again gave up everything to recover it.

The child began to reward his devotion by telling every one he was her daddy, and by maneuvering to outwit the mother. As an unmarried mother, she had the paramount right to the custody of the child. He gave up trying to secure it legally, but followed it from city to city, appearing wherever there was need. All his love for the mother disappeared. He was kind to her, because she was a stumbling block in the way of his greatest happiness. Finally the court placed the child with a boarding mother who was able to dominate the "real" mother, and for several years the little girl has known peace. The father pays all the bills, and is content. His devotion is so selfless that he never seeks to influence the child's opinion of her mother, nor to attract undue affection for himself. Friends try to dissuade him. He only becomes angry when they point out that the child is becoming more like her mother every day.

Case VI. Felicitas is three: she is a "perfect picture," a doll of a child. For a year and a half she has lived with her foster-parents, a young man and his wife in a luxurious home. The wife is childless. She has sick headaches, and speaks in a slow, faltering voice. The child is her goal in life. She has made the greatest effort of which she is capable to be an adequate mother. Physically she has succeeded. Whether she ever could have overcome her anxiety, her possessive attitude, her complete absorption in the child, may be doubted. But any one

would be anxious about Felicitas. Behind the formal wording of the petition lay such tragic facts. The foster-mother set them forth as follows:

"Felicitas is a person under the age of twenty-one, to wit, of the age of three. For more than one year last past she has been in the county of ——.

"That the parents of said child are David Ryecroft, father, and Laura Ryecroft, mother. That petitioner is informed and believes, and therefore alleges, that the parents separated prior to the birth of said Felicitas, and ever since have been and are now living separate and apart. That the said David Ryecroft is a resident of New York, and has never been in the State of ——; that he has never exercised the proper care, control or custody of said minor, and has never provided in any way whatsoever for the support of said child. That the said Laura Ryecroft is an unfit person to have the custody of said minor, that she is an habitué of night life cafés and until recently has been employed in a notorious dive and bar in ——.

"That, on or about the 6th day of August, 1925, the said Laura Ryecroft gave the said Felicitas to your petitioner, ——, and to her husband, ——; that since that time the said Laura Ryecroft has never in any way cared for said minor, nor provided for her maintenance," et cetera.

"Wherefore, your petitioner prays that this Honorable Court inquire into such matter, and that said person be declared a ward of this court . . . and for such other and further relief as may be meet in the premises."

Laura Ryecroft came to court with her mother and two gentlemen friends, and a lawyer. She was a girl of eighteen, plump, large-eyed, heavily rouged.

She leaned against her lawyer, smiled at her friends, as if she expected to win this case, as she had won the sorry little trinkets she was wearing and the ample meals and scant comfort she had found in the cabarets, by lavish use of her "charm." There was nothing aggressive about this charm; it was exactly like that of Felicitas.

The foster-mother was trembling. She began to weep, and continued to weep during the three hours of the court hearing. Her husband tried to steady her, but there was such grief on his face that it was evident that the issue was one of life and death for him.

It was not difficult to prove Laura Ryecroft an unfit mother. Reared in a country village, she had become pregnant at fourteen while working in a box factory. There had been a forced marriage to her young foreman, and the birth of a boy. Immediately afterward she became pregnant again, left her husband, gave birth to Felicitas in a maternity hospital in a distant city, "gave" the baby to the present foster-parents, and drifted into the "night life" mentioned in the petition. A landlady testified that she put her out of the house for stealing a dress, but it was obvious that Laura had violated some other section of the elaborate code of morals of the underworld, for this woman was vindictive.

What was not easy to prove was the deliberate intent to abandon necessary to secure an adoption. Laura had refused a large sum of money for her child, had written to it regularly, had bought it pink silk dresses, and coral earrings, had come to visit it, even when drunk. Laura had no intention of relinquishing her child.

David Ryecroft was not so particular. From his

box factory three thousand miles away he sent an affidavit to the effect that he was the legal owner of this child, that at all times he was willing to support his wife and child, and that now he was willing to have the foster-parents adopt it.

The maternal grandfather, divorced twice, remarried, divorced again, had written to his son-in-law:

"Laura asked me to answer your letter, and after reading it, I will say it is surely some bull. To begin with, you surely have got some nerve, even to think of asking her to come back to you. Why, you big bum, what have you got to offer her? If you love her so much, and are so lonely, why didn't you treat her right, when she was there, instead of letting her work in a box factory, but you should worry, as long as you can hang around a pool room. Mamma's Boy: Ha, ha, can't leave mother's apron strings, and then supposed to be a man. You pray for her health, you had better pray for yourself, for believe me, if I ever get you within the jurisdiction of the —— courts, I'll throw you so far in jail you'll be forgotten, and while you're praying, just mention that we will never meet. A man that takes an innocent girl and ruins her for life, and suppose she did want to come back to you, how do you expect her to get there? Do you think you can bum the fare off me? Let me tell you her name is dead to you forever, she has taken her own name, one to be proud of, and not one to shudder at, wherever it is mentioned.

"The picture you want sent back is burned. It looks more like a nigger than that of a white man.

But now it is a thing of the past, for Laura will start a new life and be happy, so don't take the trouble to write as none of us care to hear from you."

The maternal grandmother was also remarried. Formerly she had gone to public dance-halls with Laura, where she had met a Mr. C. After half a lifetime of unsavory reputation she had apparently settled down. After the Juvenile Court hearing at which the mother was declared unfit, and the child left with the foster-parents, the grandmother promptly started adoption proceedings with the mother's consent. The court is empowered to investigate the fitness of adopting parents, but nothing is said in the law about their past failures with their own children, or their ability to serve *as parents*. Provided they have paid their bills, kept out of jail, not outraged their neighbors, they may present themselves as candidates to adopt a child. In this case, there was the tie of blood to be considered. The grandmother had adopted the eight-year-old child of another daughter, had married a thrifty mechanic, Mr. C. The grandmother had won much sympathy for her suit, by fainting dead away in the court room when the matter was continued to investigate her character. This demonstration was held by witnesses and the male clerk and bailiff to indicate that she really cared a lot about Felicitas. The newspapers gave her a column.

The probation officer reported:

"Mr. and Mrs. C. live in a neat, rented bungalow in a very pleasant neighborhood. The house was adequately furnished and in good order. The

child, Ruth, has an attractive room to herself and Mrs. C. stated she would put another bed in the same room for Felicitas.

"Mrs. Henry Earl, living next door, stated she had known Mrs. C. about six months. Mr. C. was a fine fellow. The C's were well thought of by all the neighbors and Mrs. C. was a wonderful housekeeper. She also said that she thought Mrs. C. understood children because of the excellent care she has given little Ruth.

"Dr. Smith, the minister, stated that he believed the C's would certainly do well by any children under their care. She was a hard-working, home-abiding woman, very respectable and honorable, and that was her reputation in the neighborhood.

"The grocer stated every one liked the C's. They have traded with him, are good providers, and have always paid their bills promptly.

"Mr. P., a member of the Men's Club, called at the office, and in reference to the reports of bad language, and vulgar actions of Mrs. C. prior to her marriage, and her going about with various men, states that he has been in their house, unexpectedly, and by invitation, and always found them home, and the house clean, and he had never seen or heard anything he would not want his own mother and sisters to hear.

"I myself have made a dozen home visits. Whereas former reports about the grandmother of Felicitas indicated immorality, there is nothing recent. Fully eight families of property owners in the neighborhood state the C's are respectable. Mrs. C. says she wants Felicitas because she believes the two little girls should be

together, and by having children in the home that will help her to keep the affection of her husband, who is twelve years her junior. Mr. C. stated that as he could have no children of his own, he wanted Felicitas.

"It is true Felicitas is in a very good home at present. She knows no other parents than Mr. and Mrs. —— who took her in infancy, believing they could adopt her. They have given her excellent care. The motives of these foster-parents in wishing to keep this child appear to be engendered by real affection and love.

"I withhold recommendation in this case.

"Respectfully submitted,

"PROBATION OFFICER."

Alas, for courts of law! Although almost every one knows that Felicitas' parents and grandparents, and stepgrandparents are not fit to have her, how could any bill in the Legislature frame the principles of parental fitness so clearly and universally that they would be accepted by citizens? Social workers could indignantly point out the injustice to these foster-parents. But could they predict that the child would always receive wise handling in that tense, lonely home? Are people who, nature has decided, are not fit biologically to produce children, to be declared fit socially by an Act of the Legislature? Are people who bring forth healthy children, but curse them with a social inheritance more cruel than anything biology can cause, to be declared unfit to rear them? By what principles?

For although we feel that in Felicitas' case we have a family background of selfish, undisciplined emotions, crude, irresponsible relationships that give

a new, dreadful meaning to "the sins of the fathers visited upon the children to the third and fourth generation of them that hate"—(*children*)—still we admit that Felicitas's relatives differ only in degree from thousands of "normal parents."

The crux of the matter is that in this family there has been, in each member, no outgrowth from filial dependence, no development toward parenthood.

Case VII. We come now to a case, the records of which weigh thirteen pounds, and which has dragged on for five years.

Recently the father, who is a missionary, wrote to the Court:

> "This is rather a sad state of affairs where one cannot get possession of one's own child after five years' effort, two years of that time in the courts of the United States, but since it is so, we can only make the best of the situation. I only hope and pray that the child may, with all the handicaps she has had, develop into a true Christian character.
>
> "Please dismiss: I have decided to let my wife's sister keep Barbara: it is the lesser of two evils."

The first evil was the long-drawn-out litigation, the papers that had followed him over twenty states and two oceans, and searched him out in a Japanese village; the second was Barbara's aunt—a tearful, tenacious woman who had the gift of putting every one in the wrong.

Barbara's mother had requested on her death bed that her sister keep her two children. The father, however, placed his son in a military school, went into a hospital for an operation which crippled him

for life; he left Barbara with her aunt on the understanding he was to have her when he came out. The father interpreted his wife's dying request to mean that she was uncertain of his own health; her sister, however, believed that it meant he was an improper person.

The father was surprised. He had no idea his wife's sister had a low opinion of him. He had believed her sole motive was desire to have the child. He thought he was on good terms with her. However, he had forgotten that once she "loaned" him $1,000 to publish a book. Neither the book nor the money had been heard of again. It was characteristic of his sister-in-law to have mentioned this incident to every one, except himself.

He waived his right to his wife's property that Barbara might have it, and on his discharge from the hospital married his nurse. He took his son abroad, and requested that Barbara be sent him. She was then seven.

The aunt refused, and, going to court, representing that the father had deserted his child, obtained guardianship and left the state, traveling several thousand miles. In her new residence the aunt adopted Barbara. The father returned, and began action to have the guardianship revoked. This was done by the same court, presided over by the same judge who had issued it. The father showed that he had received no notification of the proceedings, although the aunt had his address. The father then located the child, and tried unsuccessfully to win her affection. Failing this, he and his wife stopped Barbara, on the way home from school, forced her to get into a car, and drove away with her to Chicago.

There she claimed she was very unhappy, was scolded, abused, and made to wash the dishes. She remained with her father several months, then met a lady on the street and told her she was kidnaped, and wanted to return to her aunt. The woman bought her a ticket and placed her on the train.

When the father discovered this he had exhausted his money. The aunt filed a petition under the Juvenile Court, alleging cruelty on the part of the father.

The court observed that Barbara was a frail girl of eleven, complaining, self-centered and self-pitying, that she had a "morbid" affection for the aunt, and while she probably would come to no good end, it would be best to leave her where she was.

The father, however, had mortgaged everything he had and settled into a mortal legal combat. All the law was on his side. He had to fight at long distance, but he had able attorneys. He was awarded custody. Barbara was placed in a "neutral" boarding home. She was obedient, tearful, prayerful. She behaved like a Christian martyr forced to reside among infidels. She adopted all her aunt's skillful mannerisms; every one was subtly in the wrong. She appealed to every one she met. Scores of letters and newspaper articles were written in her behalf. One woman said that the case was an offense against motherhood, that the only claim the father had was the fact he was a cripple. "For a court to send this girl to a heathen country, merely because the father, who is a brute, is also a cripple, is a perfect outrage."

Barbara confided to her probation officer: "I want to stay with my aunt. Some day I shall get married, but at present I am too young to think of the boys, though there are two in the neighborhood. I don't

see much of them. I prefer to be with girls. I want just one child—a little girl whom I can spoil terribly. One can make dresses for a girl out of nothing, and a boy—you have to buy his clothes ready made, and a girl looks so sweet dressed up, and a boy is always getting into trouble."

The aunt said it was unthinkable that any one would scold or punish Barbara. "She has always been a refined child. We have been allowed, when she was but five or six years old, to live in apartment houses where children were not allowed, because she was so quiet. She came to live with us when she was five years old. At first, just after her mother died, she had a very hard time, so I got her interested in the stars. Every night we watched two big bright stars and named them for her mother and her mother's mother. We would see which one would come out first. This game helped Barbara a great deal. At home we have always treated her as if she were a lady, and fine little hostess. Her interests have developed normally. She is of a religious nature and a faithful member of the little church we all attend. We have always supervised her reading; she likes it, but is not voracious. It is not difficult to call her away from a book if there is something to be done. She likes athletics, but is not proficient. Tennis is too strenuous. It is too bad people no longer care for croquet."

Her teacher said: "Barbara at home and happy makes me think of a dainty delicate flower growing in a sheltered garden. Her aunt dresses her nicely and curls her hair, and she has all the earmarks of being a loved, well-cared-for child."

The probation officer found her "most pathetic." "She cries easily, and is retarded in school. I never

knew a child who liked so much to be the center of attraction."

No wonder Barbara was retarded in school. She had spent the better part of four years in court. She was of superior intelligence, but when all the church friends of her aunt came to court, weeping and patting her on the head, Barbara would join in their weeping, and be unfit for anything else for days.

The aunt's lawyer said: "The father is a harsh, severe, dominating man: he is sick, and has to walk with a cane, and has all the characteristics that go with it. He is the most bullheaded man who ever married."

The father's lawyer, though conceding nothing in the way of superior child-love to the aunt, based his arguments on the law.

Barbara's childhood memories of her father were vague. "I can't say I was happy when I was a small child. My mother was always crying. She did not believe in spanking, but father did, and whenever he spanked me and my brother, mother would cry." Barbara went on to tell, with great animation, of her father making her get down from her chair and stick her nose into the food which she spilled.

The father, through his attorney, denied this. He said his home life had been exceptionally happy. He said that when he was in the hospital both children came to see him, and were always glad. He never stuck Barbara's nose into anything. He could not recall spanking her more than once.

Whether Barbara's evaluation of her father had been taken from the warped view of her aunt, or whether the father, like so many fathers, had forgotten the trifles that make, or mar, a child's hap-

piness, there is no telling. Certain it is that Barbara will go through life emotionally crippled. She has taken a post-graduate course in litigation. Her father's belated retreat from the battle cannot save her, for although she is now to go to a woman variously described as "a refined Christian soul" and a "sentimental old idiot," Barbara's chances for robust mental health are extremely slim.

Case VIII. Sara and her stepmother are ridiculously alike. Sara folds her fat hands over her round stomach, pulls her mouth down primly, and rolls her dark eyes in the manner of Mrs. L., who weighs two hundred and fifty pounds and dresses like a girl of ten. Sara is ten. Her father is a traveling salesman. Her mother died a few days after the child's birth.

The next year the father remarried. The stepmother had raised Sara for the past nine years, the father being preoccupied in making money. For seven years: "Mr. L. never thought of criticizing me. He has a cold, sullen disposition: he realized he was not fit to discipline a child, so I assumed all responsibility. If we had the least argument he would pack his grip and be gone for days, leaving me penniless. In 1924 he choked me so that my throat has been tender ever since. In July, 1925, we were out driving, and though I begged him not to, he drove recklessly just because he was angry. He hit a bump, causing me to strike my nose against the top of the car. I believe it was broken, because it has been somewhat out of shape since that time. One morning, when he was shaving, I wanted to discuss something with him, and he threatened to shoot any one who entered the bathroom."

The real reason for the present difficulty is that Mrs. L. was overtaken by a new religion about two years ago. As she expressed it: "I felt all along that carnal relations were wrong. Since I have acted out my belief I feel better. I told Mr. L. that I would continue to be an inspiration to him. I have. It was due to my inspiration that he added several lines of goods to his stock until he made between twelve hundred and fifteen hundred dollars a month."

Mr. L. is a gentle type of American business man. He has a cherubic appearance. He is dazed at the court proceedings. How any one on earth could consider him cruel he cannot imagine. All his life he has been dependent on women, first his mother, then his sisters; he was devotion itself to Sara's mother, and then married the first woman who was kind to him. He adored his fat little daughter, always had.

"Why, in the morning," said Mrs. L., "he would leave without kissing her good-by. I would have to watch him, or he would slip out. I would have to call him back to kiss the child good-by. Once he kicked her, and knocked her down."

The court sought to be enlightened. Sara said: "Well, it was when we were bathing in the sea, he just pushed me over with the flat of his foot."

"And did you mind that very much?"

"No, I didn't mind at the time, but mother said he shouldn't have done it. She was watching on the beach."

"Sara, as a matter of fact, has not your mother lately begun to influence you against your father?"

"No, indeed," said Sara. "She told me to love him, or hate him, just as I choose: she wouldn't interfere in any way."

"Perhaps you would like to go to your aunt."

"Oh, no. I hate all my father's people."

"Have you ever seen them?"

"No, but I am sure I would not like them."

On hearing the decision of the court that Sara was to be placed in the custody of her father, and sent to a boarding home, Mrs. L. at first grew limp, then began to scream. Sara watched her a moment, then did exactly likewise.

"Sara, come out of that instantly," said the referee. Sara obeyed with alarming alacrity. Her plump, facial contours relaxed. She smiled pleasantly, and left the court room without a word.

Singularly enough, both a social worker and a teacher described the court decision "as the most unjust and arbitrary decision the referee ever made: it was cruel to deprive a loving step-mother of the custody of Sara. "It isn't as though she ran around with men."

A year later the probation officer brought Sara in for dismissal. She was blooming with happiness. Her father sat beside her, and the two were on the best possible terms. Mrs. L. had not been heard of since the divorce.

"I think now," said Sara, "that she was just after father's money, for he always used to give her a hundred and fifty dollars to spend on me."

Case IX. A young woman came to the office. She was dressed with unusual charm and simplicity. Her manners had been formed at a fashionable girls' boarding school, but her experience had been gained in the sternest school of tragedy. She tried to conceal the trembling of her delicately rouged mouth,

but not once did she attempt to win pity, or to make her story dramatic.

She had lost track of her little girl Grace. Some one said there was a child answering Grace's description in the patios, cafés and hotel lobbies of Hollywood, a child of seven, who chatted in French and German, complained that the wine of America was not so strong as the wine of Europe, a child who discussed the latest plays and thought ". . . at her very best" in the "abortion scene." She was being towed in the wake of the brilliant Countess Y., who every one knew was no countess, but an American adventuress from Kansas. One evening the child had said laughingly: "Y.—you are a lewd woman." "Why, I am not at all," replied the countess.

"Then why did the lady hit you with her parasol while you were flirting with her husband?" "It was not my fault," replied the woman.

These were the rumors. The mother was positive it was her child.

"I can never have her. But the courts gave her to my parents. I was married at fifteen to her father. Two years ago we were lunching together very amicably—and he said: 'You know we should always be friends. You have been game. I don't care if you see Grace, sometimes.' I must have shown my pleasure, for immediately afterward he kidnaped the child, and took her to Europe. It was there he met Countess Y. Now he has given her the child."

It was, in fact, Grace who was the child-sensation of Hollywood. She was a solemn, incredibly precocious child, the sort of child Van Vechten has portrayed in "Firecrackers," and which no one but Juvenile Court officials believes to exist. Her man-

ners were grave and sweet. Her pale face, large eyes, unexpected and brilliant conversation, her nonchalant worldliness made every one gasp. Even habitués got "an awful kick out of her."

Her father was writing scenarios. He said of Grace: "This child is to be different. She is to be a lovely butterfly, flitting from flower to flower. I can hardly wait until she has her first sweetheart."

When Grace was born, her parents lived together on an income provided by the maternal grandparents. Grace's mother had been a "problem child." She was spoiled and frivolous. When she ran away to be married, her parents sighed with relief, and supported her husband lavishly.

"But nothing could appease him. He is a paranoid. You know you cannot prove paranoia in the courts. Batches of psychiatrists examined him when we were abroad. We were happy, I suppose, until Grace was born. He resented her terribly. As long as I devoted myself to her he was jealous, and moody, but the instant I left her he became devoted to her."

"Does Grace love her father?"

"You will hardly believe what I tell you: the child said: 'My father is nothing but milk of magnesia to me—just a froth, then it is all over.' He treats her like a romantic lover, kneels at her feet, says he adores her: then he leaves her for months at a time."

"You left her too, did you not?"

"Yes: there is no excuse for me. I simply left. I cannot pretend a brain-craze, or a complex. I endured it till she was two, then I deserted her. I left her alone with a man I was afraid of. . . . People will tell you I fell in love with another man. That is not so, though I later married him. He had been

shell-shocked during the war. But I left because I was in a panic. If people tell you nothing is stronger than mother-love they are wrong. Fear is stronger."

After the departure of the mother the father easily secured a divorce, and was granted the sole custody of Grace.

"They made a great fuss about him in the papers. He enjoyed that. He would do anything in the world for publicity,—no matter of what kind. Now, even if a court could be found that would grant me the custody of the child, since I am remarried, and living usefully, for the first time in my life, I wouldn't dream of starting proceedings. He would rush to the papers with every detail of the horrid mess. He is so attractive, so unscrupulous, that every one would believe him."

Grace, shortly after the divorce, was abandoned by her father. The maternal grandparents petitioned the court, had the order of his custody revoked, and secured the child. She lived with them peacefully for two years, riding her Shetland pony in their country place, and receiving the same luxurious care which her mother had had when she was a little girl. Then the father, under the strange orders that courts issue in behalf of fathers, was permitted "at reasonable times" to see his child. He "kidnaped" her, took her to Europe, and for two years no one knew the child's whereabouts. She traveled with the father, associated with his friends and mistresses, kept her amazing poise, and her deep, unchild-like gravity. She was at home anywhere. In the detention home, where she was placed for safe-keeping, until the Juvenile Court could arrange for her departure from Hollywood, to return to her grandparents, she sized up the situation: "No woman who

has two such nice dogs could be unkind to me. I shall be happy here, though I think the food is a little monotonous."

In one thing only Grace rebelled. She refused to "coöperate" in her psychological examination. She was making bead bags at the time. "Why should I answer those questions? I think they are silly. Really, Dr. ——, I am not interested." No one will ever know what Grace's I.Q.[10] might have been. She is the only child on record in the court who succeeded in outwitting the psychologist.

On the long trip across the continent she made friends with her probation officer: "Sweetie, is there anything of interest to see?"

"Soon we shall be crossing the desert."

"The desert!" cried the child. In her excitement she refused to sleep. Late at night she was peering from her window:

"Why here—there is nothing but sand."

"What did you expect?"

"Why, of course, I thought on the desert I would find a Sheik."

The probation officer explained. Grace began to weep. These were the first tears she had shed.

"What is the matter?"

"Oh, it all reminds me of Valentino. He is dead. I shall never see him. I was going to have him wait for me, until I had grown up."

Case X. Dorothy is fifteen, a pale, slender girl, weighing ninety pounds. She has an unhappy worried expression, and unhealthy appearance; her hair

[10] The Intelligence Quotient, as determined by mental tests, a routine procedure to which all children, together with a physical examination, are submitted in most modern Juvenile Courts.

falls in long curls. Her posture is stooped. Her dress is old-fashioned, and she wears a poke bonnet which hides her face.

Her high school record has always been excellent, though she lacks self-confidence. She talks timidly in a low voice, and bites her nails.

Her grandmother filed the petition which brought her before the court. The grandmother said the girl was unruly and beyond her control. She wished to have the help of a probation officer in making Dorothy do what she should. Dorothy looked about the little court room in the detention home, and said: "Other girls stay here. I would rather stay in the detention home the rest of my life than go back to my grandmother."

This seemed to be the first positive statement Dorothy had ever made in her life. She had the appearance of a child who has never been allowed to express an opinion.

Dorothy has two parents living. Her father left her mother when she was a year and a half old. Her mother kept her until she was three, then gave her to her husband's mother.

Shortly after, she remarried, and had four children. Last year the father remarried and now he wishes Dorothy to live with him. Timid and shy as Dorothy is she says she would rather stay in the detention home than go to either father, or grandmother.

"Why not your mother?"

"My mother placed me in an orphanage. I have one other sister. I saw her two years ago. She is so 'snippy,' I wouldn't care to live near her."

Dorothy is hungering for companions her own age, but her grandmother never allowed it. She had

no girl friends, and only one boy friend. "I just can't live with my grandmother any longer. She doesn't like anything I like."

The grandmother was an energetic old lady. She belonged to many lodges, and used to take Dorothy to dances at the Old Soldiers' home. As Dorothy said: "They were all between seventy and ninety years of age. Grandma had lots of attention. They would want to hold me on their laps and tickle me. I guess that is why I am afraid of men."

When Dorothy was fourteen the grandmother decided the father was not paying enough for board, so she got Dorothy a job selling tickets at night in a dance hall at the beach. Her grandmother would bring her down at eight P.M. and sit and wait for her until midnight, then take her pay.

Her grandmother told her that some day she would be rich, she would make her will in her favor. Dorothy says she used to look at her and wonder how long she would live—that she looked so straight and tall that it seemed she would live forever.

Dorothy had never attended a show in her life. Sometimes there was hardly enough to eat in the house, and she never remembered having a "second helping." This was because the grandmother wished to save food and clothes for the missionaries. She used to say she was a "great Christian," but Dorothy never believed her because: "I know how stingy she was."

The grandmother said the father had been a "bad man, ever since he was a mere boy." She herself had been married three times, and each of her husbands had died. She was the youngest of eight children, and had been dominated by her father, a dignified, energetic, righteous man. Her first hus-

band, Dorothy's grandfather, was twenty years older than herself. She spent her time going to religious revivals, during one of which her hushand died, alone in the house, save for Dorothy's father, then ten years old.

He was left with his dead father for three hours. On his mother's return he rebuked her in such terms that she fled from the house. She never forgave him; she would rather see "Dorothy dead than go to her father."

This opinion was shared by eight old ladies, and three veterans from the Soldiers' home. Mrs. Lucretia Smith said she had known the grandmother sixty years, and a better woman never lived. "Dorothy is a wicked, ungrateful child if she does not return to her grandmother after all she has done for her." None of them could say a word against Dorothy's conduct in any other respect. At the conclusion of the court hearing, Dorothy went to her father and stepmother, "the first woman I ever knew with whom I could be comfortable," and the grandmother changed her will, leaving everything to an old soldier.[11]

It is obvious that the community does not understand custody conflicts over children. It lingers in the period of legal philosophy which regarded children as property. To this view the principle of child welfare is in opposition. The Juvenile Court is confronted with the problem of dealing with the right of the child to happiness and the rights of adults. It seeks to reconcile these somehow with

[11] These cases have been selected from fifty custody cases which have been specially studied from the legal point of view by Orfa Jean Shontz, 1030 Citizens National Bank Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.

the findings of modern science and social work as to what the ultimate welfare of the child is likely to require. This task is impossible unless we proceed on an experimental basis, never deciding a case once for all but exercising supervision over a long period of time. Tremendous chances must be taken. Hardship must be endured by everybody, most of all by the child. The community is saturated with the sentimental tradition that "love" of a child, desire to possess it, is an indication of praiseworthy selflessness. On the contrary we find it so often an entirely selfish motive that courts are justified in scrutinizing it with suspicion. Our goals of child protection have changed entirely since the time of Blackstone. Parents no longer can shield themselves behind *natural* rights. A new sense of chivalry toward childhood must be developed in communities; adults who prove to be stumbling-blocks to the welfare of children, must be removed no matter how much pain it causes them.

CHAPTER VII

"I WOULD RATHER DIE THAN GO HOME"

Studies in antagonistic parent-child relationships.

ANTAGONISM between parent and child is a normal accompaniment of family life, so much so that a sociologist has defined the family "as an experiment in antagonistic coöperation." Because of the social nature of the family, its necessarily anxious concern with education, manners and morals, we shall always find some degree of antagonism between parents and the children they strive to impress with their code. The very closeness of the relationship, based on necessity, not choice,—the fact there is so much at stake—causes the tension, which, coupled with faulty technique and wrong attitudes, builds a structure of emotional response which may develop easily as antagonism. As all great religions have begun in heresy, so the entry of the individual child into new modes of thought and feeling, his acquisition of new skills, will often begin in a struggle against his parents. This struggle may prove a spur to the child's resolve, may harden him into wholesome independence. It may be just the thing he needs for his emancipation. Also, it may be just the thing the parent needs, forcing him in middle age to take in new experience, freeing him from enslavement to a child who no longer needs rearing. "Personality, like every other force, reaches its maximum when it encounters resistance, in conflict and

in rivalry—when it fights." It is not this normal kind of antagonism which we scrutinize here.

The Los Angeles studies in family antagonism.

All those whose business it is to listen to the troubles of children are surprised to observe how few of them hold grudges. It is not merely that the child commonly feels no ill will toward the parent who has injured him; the injury seems to have left no trace. It has faded out of mind before the bruise is healed. For this reason it is extraordinarily difficult to give children of unkind parents any adequate legal protection. Ninety-nine times out of a hundred, the child witness in a case of parental cruelty before the Juvenile Court insists on going home. The incurable loyalty of children to unworthy adults is often the despair of the social worker.

An eleven-year-old boy whose father was a garbage collector was made to work daily from four until eight A.M. and from seven until ten P.M. He was beaten and underfed. When reported by the school department, the court found him twenty pounds underweight, heavily marked with cuts from a leather strap and in need of medical care. He was placed in a foster home. The father got a lawyer and appealed the case. The proceedings took about twelve weeks. So swift is the restorative process in the body and mind of a young child that, when the boy came again before the court, he was no longer useful as evidence. He had regained his lost weight. He was smiling and happy. He wished to go home. Those who imagine that human emotion works logically would have predicted that here, if anywhere, was a case when a child would say,

"I would rather die than go home." He had nothing against his foster home. But it was evident that his own home gave him something that the mere kindness and plenty of the foster home could not furnish, and that all the social workers in the world would fail to supply. Like a devotee to some exacting religion after a brief enforced rest returning gladly to his duties as soon as his wasted body is repaired, so the child thanked his benefactors courteously but was eager to depart. Freedom from pain and hunger were not to be outweighed against other more urgent needs. "I was licked only when I needed it," is the usual answer in court cases against cruel parents.

Antagonism of a child to a parent is founded on nothing so tangible as physical injury.

The antagonism with which we are concerned here is something deeper, more baffling and more sinister. It lies at the root of what we may call insoluble family problems. We may glimpse it in court in such acts as continued running away, persistent refusal to return home, marked defiance, but especially in expressions of coldness and dislike, not only in actions and words, but in mute evidence from the body itself, when, in the presence of the parent, the child shrinks from a caress, shows pallor or change of color, muscular tensions, a changed voice and posture. Some of these cases of antagonism have been studied individually.[1]

These fifty cases were selected on the basis of courtroom impressions, the test being merely the

[1] Dorothy Crowley Frost, M.A., is conducting research into the antagonistic child-parent relationship. She has made case studies of some fifty girls from the Los Angeles Juvenile Court. Some of the illustrations for this chapter have been supplied by Mrs. Frost.

child's emphatic request to be placed anywhere on earth but home. The children were adolescent girls between the ages of twelve and nineteen. They fall into four groups:

1. Those who have filed petitions themselves, asking the protection of the court against their parents.
2. Those against whom the parents have complained as being incorrigible and refusing to obey their "reasonable orders and commands."
3. Runaway girls where the chief factor in the elopement is apparently antagonism to parents.
4. Cases of delinquency where antagonism is openly expressed by child or parent, either by overt acts of rebellion or violence, or an unshakable attitude of hostility.

From the fifty cases, twelve were selected for intensive study. The study included survey of the court records by the research worker, personal interviews with all members of the family, school teachers, neighbors, companions, employer and the probation officer. Then followed a careful study of the child herself, a physical examination by Dr. Hannah J. Beatty, a psychological examination by Dr. S. Carol Fisher, and where it seemed advisable, the child was seen by a psychiatrist.[2] The worker had from three to six interviews with the child, observing her at luncheons and recreation excursions, as well as in the clinic or office. The home, neighborhood and school were studied in the usual social case work method. The cases were then submitted to a conference for discussion; the opinions of social

[2] Dr. Aaron J. Rosanoff. In addition, the outstanding cases were given personality tests, including the Downey-Will Profile by Dr. Elizabeth L. Woods, Department of Psychology and Educational Research, Los Angeles Public Schools.

workers, parents and teachers were gathered and tabulated.[3]

The first impression we receive is that the antagonism is based on what we might call nothing at all! Not the child shivering on the worst bed in the house, discriminated against, eating what is left, getting blows, reprimands, and injuries is the one most likely to fall victim to the insidious disease of antagonism; on the contrary, we find it more frequently among children who seem well off from the skin out and who are hard put to find any tangible ills to complain of.

A social worker is mystified when a girl who seems to have a good home, and has taken her chances for a week or so among the average unlovable set of human beings found in the average detention home, declares that she prefers it, or the state school, in fact anything which may befall her rather than a return to the parental roof. The social worker's first reaction is to blame the home. "Something is wrong, we will wait and see." Since most children prefer bad homes to good institutions or "private families," there must be something extraordinarily the matter with a home "I would rather die than go to." So there is, but it is nothing the social worker can discover by an ordinary social investigation. The social worker then turns to foster-parents. They receive the girl with expectant sympathy, but usually soon return her to the court: "She is impossible." Then the social worker says:

"I supposed Nellie's mother was hard and unfeel-

[3] The parents referred to were selected from a class in parent-education. For complete results of this study see Mrs. Dorothy Crowley Frost, 1030 Citizens National Bank Bldg., Los Angeles, California. Mimeographed copies will shortly be available.

ing and unjust, but I guess she knows her child better than I do." The court faces a blank wall. The girl will not live at home, if she is forced to return she runs away. Often she cannot get along in any other home; she is too young to work, and it appears unjust "to commit" her, for "she has not done anything." Her growth as a human being requires the family relationship, yet when this food is put in her mouth it does not nourish her.

Summary of the results.

All of the children studied were American-born girls within the normal range of intelligence. The intelligence quotients vary from 83 per cent to 127 per cent; one each 83 per cent, 84 per cent and 86 per cent; two 92 per cent; two 103 per cent; three 109 per cent; one 112 per cent and one 127 per cent. Two of the girls are high school graduates, one is a senior in high school, one a junior in the university, two have stopped school after completing the sixth and seventh grades respectively; the others are still in grade school. One of the girls shows marked musical ability, particularly in composition. She has published some charming songs, and at present is studying harmony and organ at the state university. Another has rather unusual talent with the violin.

As to their physical condition there is nothing outstanding; no tuberculosis, epilepsy, syphilis, or nervous instability. Three of the girls have had gonorrhea, one through infection from the mother. Six are underweight. One of these has a glandular imbalance.[4] There are two cases of underweight.

[4] The psychiatrist reported that he did not believe the physical condition accounted for the emotional disturbance.

Three of the girls have serious eye-strain, and three bad tonsils.

The economic condition of the families varies. In six cases the homes are owned by the parents. The mother of one of the girls is a laundress, going out by the day, with an average income of about ninety dollars a month. Another mother is principal of one of the public schools. One family has been assisted for a brief period by the county charities, but in no case has prolonged poverty or deprivation been an outstanding factor. None of the families had previous court records. In each instance the particular difficulty with the child was the occasion for the first appearance in court. No acts of violent physical cruelty or injury had been committed by the parents against the children.

Family relationships were found unsatisfactory in the following aspects: In nine out of the twelve cases, there are broken homes; in three instances the father is dead, in six the parents are divorced. The presence of uncongenial stepfathers and stepmothers, the fact that where the father was living the mother had a poor opinion of him, holding him up to the child as an unworthy object, economically, socially, morally, or esthetically; dominance of the mother by the father, or, after his death, her undue reliance on some male friend, relative or counselor outside the family, growth of feeling on the part of the child that she did not belong to the family and was not wanted, conflicts over religion between the parents, interference of relatives and neighbors in child management, lack of privacy in living arrangements, infliction of petty slights and humiliations, trivial unjust accusations, broken promises, unwise administration of discipline, tactless reprimands,

nagging and the like have contributed to the development of antagonism.

The personality of the friends to whom the child turns was studied. In every case it was some older man or woman, who seemed to stand *in loco parentis* and to supply the real or fancied gaps in the home. It was as if the child were seeking the missing parent.

The personalities of the children themselves present serious difficulties. They are trouble-makers, prone to false accusations, lying, blackmailing; they are moody, suspicious and incapable of team-work, or team-play. They tend to disrupt any social group. They are the gravest problem to educators and social workers; they project their antagonism to the school, to probation officers, foster-homes, or any one who has an authoritative position. Those who seek to apply social treatment are baffled. Should one of them fall ill with mental disease her recovery would be doubtful:

"The most important determinant of the malignancy and incurability of the psychopath's methods of thinking is hatred. A conception that is formulated in order to permit hate to obtain gratification is more difficult to change than any other. This is due to the fact that the hater can not admit inferiority or error to his opponent, that being a form of submission and acceptance of the opponent's righteousness and superiority. Hatred does not tend to accept a situation, but is so constituted that it must modify or destroy it; hence, if a faulty conviction is established gratifying hatred, there is likely to be a serious eccentricity in the adjustment to reality.

"Society soon becomes afraid of, or at least loses

confidence in, the man who chronically hates, and the tendency, if hatred is quite volcanic and asocially eccentric in its demands, is to isolate the individual." [5]

Although these girls had committed no serious offenses, their overt acts being limited to truancy, petty stealing (usually clothes), disobedience, and slipping out of the window at night, they cause serious damage because they are sources of infection to others, robbing them of friends, trust in life, interest in simple pleasures. They add vastly to the currents of ill will in the world.

They would indeed make good citizens if human society were formed as Hobbes described it, a "war of each against all," where social control was fought for, and the individual yielded, "supported by a prudent calculation of consequences, and enforced by an external power." For these young people are prudent calculators, they talk a great deal about justice, they believe in "rational motives," and know nothing of love. Most of our present treatment of criminals is based on the assumption that criminals have this kind of personality. The treatment, of course, does them no more good than it would other human beings, but it is the cause back of most of our failures. Fortunately the antagonistic personality is extremely rare among children.

Surveying our cases in detail, we find certain outstanding factors:

The "baulked disposition." [6]

Jennie is a slender girl of eighteen, medium height, with light brown hair, blue eyes, and clear, fair skin.

[5] Kempf, Edward J., M.D.: "Psychopathology." St. Louis, C. V. Masby Co., 1921, pp. 550-551.

[6] This phrase is used by Graham Wallas.

Her manner is appealing, almost childish usually, but suddenly she will grow "frozen" and reticent. She has been known to the court since she was eleven; now she is about to be married. She is living with a small group of girls about her own age in a club. She has held four jobs in six months. She is an expert stenographer. The first time she left because the "surroundings were not refined." The next employer fired her after a few weeks because she was "so much on the defensive, suddenly shutting up and withdrawing into herself, as if she was afraid of everybody." Why she lost the third job was a mystery. The place was refined enough to suit her fastidious taste, she was punctual and thorough, there was no definite complaint. The director of the employment division hinted something about her "superior manner," but did not care to discuss it. It was evident that Jennie was a distinct employment liability; her services and personal attractiveness were offset by something indefinably sinister in personality. Nevertheless she got another job in a lawyer's office, where it seemed every one was too absorbed to notice it.

Her school record was unsatisfactory. Though of superior intelligence, she was twice expelled. "If a rule was laid down, it seemed she just had to break it." Her manner of "accepting" criticism angered her teachers. "She wants to stand out and be different from all the others." "She seems to derive satisfaction from hurting people's feelings." "She will never unburden herself in any way; it is as though she had utter contempt for us." She would leave the grounds whenever she felt like it, would fail to register in classes, and, when confronted, would stare at the teacher and refuse to open her mouth. She had no particular friendships with any

of her schoolmates. Once she developed affection for a teacher, but later she said: "I was disappointed in her," and referred to her in her diary as "Feet of Clay."

If a girl at the club used her face-powder she said: "They are thieves here." She "ran every one down, so she could shine by comparison." She could never bear the least argument. A difference in opinion she could not tolerate; she acted as though "it was an effort on the part of the other person to frustrate her."

Negativism is her most frequent attitude. If she is invited to a theater party, she refuses to go. If any one praises a dessert at dinner, she will not eat it. If some one suggests she is underweight, she proceeds to diet. Though unusually careful about her appearance, she plastered her face with rouge and mascara after hearing a lecture on the moderate use of cosmetics by business girls. Her attitude appears bizarre; we cannot understand it unless we trace its slow growth, through miseries no child should endure.

Jennie's father was a carpenter. He was born in New England, of an old Catholic family. He married a woman fourteen years younger, a gay Southern girl, who ran away from her husband, leaving seven children, Jennie, aged five, being the youngest. She returned after an absence of several months, stayed a year, then deserted permanently, permitting her husband to divorce her, so she could "marry a man her own age."

Jennie remembers that her father was a morose, stubborn, grouchy man, refusing to talk for weeks at a time, then ending up with violent quarrels. Both parents were constantly criticizing each other, try-

ing to get the children to side with one against the other. Jennie said: "I don't see how any mother could leave her children. She had to, though, because she had too many. My father thought it would be criminal to keep from having them in any way."

After the parents separated, the children were sent to a friend's house to live. The father quarreled with the friend, and they were sent to an orphanage. When Jennie was eight they were returned to the father. He took them to New England. There the mother visited, and she had "enough sense to see we weren't getting the right sort of things to eat, nor the right sort of home." She reported them to a Children's Aid Society, and relinquished her right to them, for adoption. The father signed the papers too. Each of the seven was adopted into a different home. Jennie came to live in California. She says she does not remember her mother very well, but "didn't like her." Her father, however, she likes and all her day dreams are about the time she will go to live with him and go to college, and become a public speaker.

Jennie's adopted parents were aged. They kept a goat ranch and Jennie was supposed to deliver the milk. She hated this because none of the other children in the neighborhood delivered milk. The adopted parents were severe. The girl complained that their manners were coarse. "My foster-mother was old, and didn't understand that girls don't want to be old-fashioned. She didn't like the way I wanted to dress. She wanted me to wear cotton stockings and things like that."

The foster-father, though he had heart trouble and could do no heavy work, used to cut switches

from the garden and whip Jennie. Finally they brought her to the court and Jennie refused to return with them.

She was tried in four foster-homes and two boarding schools within the next three years.

In one home Jennie made trouble between husband and wife by saying the husband was attentive to her. In another she sided with the wife against the husband, and made her so dissatisfied she started divorce proceedings. Jennie resisted all the attempts of adults to help her. She attracted pity. Her appealing face, her troubled history made people long to help her. She mistrusted motives, saying: "You may send me to the reform school: I had rather go there now." She was attractive to boys, but she never permitted them to become friends. One proposed to her and she accepted, saying he was a fine boy and "came from a lovely family, and his people wish to raise me as their only daughter."

When her probation officer went to investigate she found that he lived in a poor shack, in filth and poverty. Jennie never forgave her probation officer for this "interference."

The court realized that "the reform school," with its military routine and its large percentage of girls with average mentality or less, would do nothing for Jennie except accentuate her resentment to authority. Therefore she was placed, after numerous futile experiments, in a girls' club. Here she met Arthur, aged thirty. He was in many respects like the image of the dream-father she had conjured. He was generous, and he adored her, making her dainty gifts, and laughing at her moods. How the matter will turn out no one can predict. He is evidently better fitted for the task than any one who has tried it. The

probation officer has explained to him her "baulked disposition," and its probable causes. If Jennie develops a bad case of "spousal negativism," [7] he cannot say he was not warned. In all other respects Jennie is a most desirable person.

Failure to develop adequate personality.

"The person is an individual who has status. We come into the world as individuals. We acquire status, and become persons. Status means position in society. . . . The individual whose conception of himself does not conform to his status is an isolated individual." The "individual may have many 'selves' according to the groups to which he belongs and the extent to which each of these groups is isolated from the others." [8]

One of the results of an antagonistic relation to parents is failure to develop an adequate personality.

The problem presented by Clara, aged seventeen, does not consist in her irregular school attendance, her frequent change of employment, her running away from home, and petty dishonesty, nor the late hours she keeps: it is found in her general untrustworthiness. Physically normal, she has no energy. The least exertion fatigues her. Mentally normal, passing readily the most difficult "ingenuity test," she still talks "baby talk," loves to play only with little children, is panicky when confronted with difficulties, and although longing to become a nurse, cannot finish high school. She lives "under cover." None of Clara's interests are socially acceptable.

[7] Dr. Gilbert Hamilton.

[8] Park, Robert E. and Burges, Ernest W.: "Introduction to the Science of Sociology," University of Chicago Press, 1921, p. 55.

She gives verbal consent to the code of others; she never argues, nor makes a positive statement. She has in fact no initiative; when she "gets into trouble," it is because she yields to some chance invitation to dine or dance in a forbidden place.

She is anxious to please, and does please, but her method is always to react to what she thinks people expect of her. She is irresponsible. Her employer left her to care for two children, aged three and one and a half years. Clara waited until the mother had gone, then left without feeding them. She locked the door, put the key in her pocket and went to the beach with two boys. The family, on returning, could not get in; they had to climb in through a window.

Clara, on being rebuked, showed not the slightest concern.

"Why didn't you tell me you wanted to go to the beach?" said the mother. "You should not have gone when we were out."

"Oh," said Clara, "it was so nice to go, and I knew you would not have let me."

Later, when her employer ransacked Clara's desk, read all her letters, disclosed to the probation officer numerous addresses and "dates," and photographs of sailors, Clara showed no resentment.

Indeed Clara was resentful of nothing save being sent home. Once she was sent to the receiving hospital after being slightly injured in an accident. She gave her maternal aunt, a woman who lived at some distance, as her "nearest relative," although her mother and stepfather lived only a few streets away. Her one tribute to family life is her persistent request, after many failures, to be allowed to work in "a private family."

When her mother is mentioned Clara becomes stony. The mother was fourteen when Clara was born; she is now thirty-one. She has seven brothers and sisters, of sturdy stock; the youngest, aged nineteen, is an honor student in the university. The mother considered that she married beneath her. Her husband died shortly after Clara's birth. He was a farmer, his manners were uncouth and his leisure was spent in singing, playing the banjo, and composing little songs. The mother considered him unworthy of making decisions. She ridiculed his simplicity. When Clara was four she remarried a stern man, several years her senior. He promptly "took a hand" in Clara's education. He himself had never been to high school, so he wanted Clara to go; he did not believe in bobbed hair, nor short skirts. When Clara complained that her stepfather had no right to punish her, her mother replied: "Who has a better right? Your own father was trifling; he never amounted to anything. I was ashamed of him. He didn't know how to act in company. His nails were always filled with dirt. He drank too."

Clara kept her father's picture in her bedroom. Her mother discovered her weeping over it, and slapped her, and burned the picture.

Clara's probation officer reported that "the mother is aghast at what Clara does, but she has no suggestions; she says she must consult her husband."

Thus it was that Clara acquired no status in her mother's home. She has no confidence in adults, hence people say she is "deceitful." Her antagonism expresses itself in no overt acts, she merely smiles to herself, and refuses to go home. If she is sent, she runs away. No one has a good word for Clara; "there is nothing to her," she "has no depth." If

she is crossed, she resorts to "tears and baby talk." "No one ever gained a sincere opinion from her."

Clara's personality is inadequate to meet the demands of the adult world.

Some cases which appear to have family conditions which make for antagonism develop "normality."

Lest any one attribute solely to any one series of causes the development of unfortunate personalities, let us consider the case of Marion. She is fourteen. She came before the court as a witness in a case of alleged sexual misconduct on the part of her father. After the case was over, and the charge against the man dismissed for lack of evidence, Marion was so unhappy at home, that the court permitted her to enter a girls' opportunity school. She is moody, she feels that life gave her an exceptionally "raw deal." She develops crushes on older women, but her energy is constant. She makes rapid progress in school, is excellent in the work-shop and on the playground, listens to criticism almost eagerly, and adapts her dress, manners and pursuits to standards judged suitable by the school authorities. Her intellectual interests are persistent. She is not markedly more intelligent than Clara, but there is a momentum behind her which causes her to forge ahead. She is not a very "good sport"; if anything displeases her in a game, she will "walk out." She has temper-tantrums. She swears a good deal, and on being told she could not have boy friends at the school, said, "They might as well have a ball and chain on us." Nevertheless, when she adores any one she accepts the point of view offered, and makes no contribution of her own. Her upsets of mood gradually become less frequent. Every one thinks she will make a "good adjustment."

The outstanding liability in Marion's family life is her stepmother. During the day she works away from home in a millinery shop; at night she attends spiritualist meetings. Still, she was home enough to make every one perfectly miserable. She combined slovenly housekeeping with a nagging fusillade about order and thrift. She reminded her husband that she had married him only because he had threatened suicide if she did not. After marriage the father gave up his job in a pool hall and went with her on tours to preach spiritualism. Sometimes he sold soda pop.

He had had no comfort as a child; he had left home in early boyhood, driven out by a harsh father. At eighteen he married Marion's mother, a jolly, competent girl his own age. The mother supported her family by keeping a boarding house. The father helped her. They had two children. The oldest, a boy, was a good student, passing from high school to the state university, seemingly unharmed by the meagerness of physical or cultural life in his home. He worked regularly, out of school hours, and gave his father his wages. Not until Marion came before the court did he leave: "I left home then because nobody took any interest in the place." The mother had died when he was four and Marion two.

Marion was puzzled by her father's conduct. She had accepted the stepmother who came into the family when she was ten without resentment, although the woman dominated her father completely and was cruel in her punishment of the children. The father had been so weak and helpless that Marion felt only pity. Suddenly when she was thirteen he began to frighten her. He treated her like a lover. One night he carried her into his bed. The stepmother was away from home, but Marion

would have been more afraid of her than her father. In the morning she told her school teacher.

The jury dismissed the case for lack of evidence. Though there was not the least proof, the father's lawyer succeeded in covering Marion with a filthy reputation. The stepmother was an aid in this project.

Months later, after Marion was happily settled in the "opportunity" school, the field worker called at the home. She did not succeed in getting in. Her interview was conducted through a locked screen door. From somewhere within the house, the father was heard moving about. The stepmother stood at the door, and relayed the questions to him; when he would attempt to answer, she would shout: "Father, be careful. Remember, you have a lawyer."

"What do you want, anyhow?" she asked the field worker.

"We want some information; we merely want to help Marion."

"Well, you can go home then and tell every one that we can't help *Marion:* her father's financial status is nil."

The stepmother said: "We don't even go to church now; since our trouble we can't hold up our heads."

She abused her neighbors. The field worker reported: "She is like a steam roller. She will never forgive any one who has been kind to Marion. She said that Marion, after her mother's death, had been sent to a convent, from which she took her 'wild as an Indian, and crazy for the boys.' I cannot find that Marion ever did anything wrong. The only incident the stepmother could mention was that she was ten minutes late once in returning from an er-

rand, and she was seen walking through a field with a boy."

What then were the assets in Marion's life? She had passed through intolerable conditions unscathed. We may list her intelligence,[9] her normal health, her attitude toward authority, but how explain the forces which make her escape a rock on which shipwreck seemed imminent? Is it because on the maternal side there were stable traditions, and that Marion had formed an *idealization* of her parents, particularly her mother? We do not know. This case, however, illustrates the necessity of studying the life-history individually, and of not relying too much on any one series of facts for explanation.

Relation of the antagonistic personality to criminality.

"Conscience, then, and the feelings of guilt and duty are the peculiar possessions of the gregarious animal. A dog and a cat caught in the commission of an offense will both recognize that punishment is coming,[10] but the dog, moreover, knows that he has done *wrong,* and will come to be punished, unwillingly, it is true, and as if dragged along by some power outside him, while the cat's sole impulse is to escape." [11]

That the solitary animal has no *sense of sin* Trotter thinks equivalent to saying the isolated

[9] Intelligence Quotient 115 per cent.

[10] If any one can be found so lacking in a sense of fitness as to think of punishing a cat! For as every one knows: "It is much easier for a cat to train a man, than for a man to seek to train a cat."

[11] Trotter, W.: "Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War." New York, 1916, p. 40.

human individual has none, by reason of some *innate* characteristic.

The isolation of the criminal has been pointed out repeatedly. Social workers know that the offender, like the Negro, is doomed to remain, until we revise our attitudes, in a special class and can hardly be said to be part of the modern world. The criminal "leads an intense emotional life . . . his activity is pointed against the community as a whole." "He trusts no one, and fears no one. . . . He lives on the brink of a deep precipice." [12]

I do not believe we can rely on Trotter's analogy of the gregarious and the solitary animal, with its implication that these traits are inborn in human beings. The criminals to which Tannenbaum refers have not been studied in detail. It is astonishing that our life-histories of offenders are so few, and where they exist, so meager. No amount of statistics and no generalizations can supply this lack. The studies we have indicate that antagonism to parents is an outstanding factor in building up a sense of isolation and its resulting hostility to society. The professional swindler and the blackmailer are good examples.

There are many indications from the literature of Child Guidance Clinics that what promises to be a warped personality may be completely transformed by skillful treatment in early childhood.

Antagonism interferes with the acquisition of skill.

The contrast presented by the intelligence and talent of the children studied and their poor record

[12] Tannenbaum, Frank: "Prison Democracy," *Atlantic Monthly,* October 1920, pp. 438-439.

of achievement is noteworthy. Only two cases attained any kind of skill. "Impertinence" to school teachers, group leaders and others, seems to be the stumbling block. The child's attention is divided. There is no whole-hearted interest in the objective world; everything has a personal reference. The antagonistic personality is looking for slights.

Gail's is the type of personality of whom it is said: "She cannot be reached." She is fourteen years old, but she looks two years older. When she came to the court because of "incorrigibility" she was sent at once to a girls' school. She is tall and strong but has a stooped posture. She plays ball well, but she could not make the team because she is always bickering over trifles. In any group she remains on the fringe. She does not seem to react like any one else. Once, when she won the high-jump and her name was mentioned in student body meeting, she turned pale, her eyes filled with tears, she seemed not so much embarrassed as irritated. Another time she had designed a poster for a play. It was a strikingly beautiful thing with a unique use of planes and color. When a visitor spoke of it, Gail was made to get up and show herself. Long after the attention of every one had flown on to something else, Gail sat in her corner on the floor, her chin dropped on her chest, her body pasted flat against the wall like some primitive bas-relief meant to express utter failure, fatigue, and self-pity.

At first sight her appearance attracted the interest of adults; her black eyes, with dark circles underneath, her tomboy swagger, her appealing, intelligent face made them long to help her. The gymnasium teacher insisted that Gail be made captain of the Girl Reserves so that she could "develop responsi-

bility." In the tennis tournament Gail claimed the best racquet and used it all the time. She was harsh and arbitrary in her dealings with the girls, unfair in her decisions, argumentative, dictatorial, affected in manner, supercilious, selfish, and exceptionally skilled in making cruel remarks, often bored, always indifferent, "only happy when some one else was in tears."

As her teachers came to know her better they disliked her; they could not help it, she aroused a vague antagonism spontaneously. Even her clothes were irritating, those straight, tight, sleeveless little "child-gimps," sewed onto long full skirts. To be sure her mother had outfitted her with these infantile garments, but there was the sewing room in which girls who cared could correct parental mistakes in clothes. They began to say of Gail: "She gives the appearance of a bright intelligent girl, but the better you get acquainted with her, the more you question her intelligence. What makes her look so blank? Her eyes have a film over them sometimes. She is sleepy. You cannot wake her up in the morning. She pays no attention in school. She does not respond to the efforts of those wishing to help her. Though not easily detected in falsehood, she gives the impression of lying and insincerity. She is uncommunicative and evasive, does not seem particularly interested in anything; an extremely difficult child to talk with; everything has to be pumped out. She is so sullen and discontented." This feeling on the part of the teachers was the reason why Gail "got nothing out of school." The psychologist gave her an intelligence rating of superior normal, but she made no academic progress. Her music teacher

refused to give her lessons because she was so insolent.

For some time the teachers had noticed that Gail was "queer" about love. She had an antipathy to being touched. She did not seem capable of feeling affection; she objected to caresses; her attitude toward them was the same as if they had been blows. She was "crazy about animals," and lavish in hugs, kisses, pats, chokings and shakings of puppies, but she took no care to feed, water, or bed them. There was something in her attitude that saddened true animal lovers, she seemed so indifferent to their feelings, so filled with a sense of greedy possession, so incapable of the joy of observation.

It was also remarked that Gail had, as it were, a tiny, hidden hair-trigger spring, or button, which, if touched, or innocently brushed against, would cause an explosion. She could not bear the least criticism. The mildest show of authority filled her with some strange reaction as if she had been poisoned by a deadly chemical. Her teachers began to be a little afraid of her. They said: "She is incapable of remorse. She has no sense of right and wrong. She simply cannot see why any one has a right to prohibit her from doing whatever she chooses."

One teacher was baffled: "She seemed to sort of like me. Then one afternoon she was sitting doing nothing and I asked her a question, just a remark. At first she seemed confused, as if she did not know what she wanted, then she got terribly angry as if she were going to strike me."

Gail had been one of the children who said in court: "I would rather die than go home."

The home was a neat one with trim box hedges

and rows of flowers. Her father had been an engineer, but, as his wife's lawyer said, "he had given up a good job and become a day laborer to avoid the payment of alimony. He hated his wife that much." At the time of the divorce Gail was four and her father was already an old man. She was "given" to her young mother, who had shown almost no interest or affection for her daughter until the lavish display in court which made even her witnesses say: "She is claiming the child to spite Joe." Gail slipped in and out of boarding homes until she was eight. Then her mother dropped out of sight.

Gail to-day speaks of this illusive parent as if she were the embodiment of all that is gracious, tender, and exquisite to look upon. She carries a picture of her mother about with her but there is nothing in that picture which would identify it with the gorgeous image that Gail has created.

On her desertion by her mother, Gail was sent to live with her father and stepmother. The stepmother was born in England. She was a small, very thin, worn-looking woman with a scant, stringy bob. She was about forty-nine when Gail came to live with her. Her whole body was tense and expressive of strains. She was over-anxious about her housework and her duties in regard to Gail. She was zealous about unimportant details. Some one described her desire for affection as pathetic. Her caresses were awkward and repressed.

Gail started to school. In her own mother's company she had lived happily, she had no idea why the court "took her away." It was true her mother came to see her rarely, but when she did, and especially on those scarlet occasions when she visited her mother's flat, she had a good time. There was

noise, plenty to eat and drink, and lots of "daddies." Gail recounted these jolly adventures to the English stepmother and to her school friends. At ten she was expelled from school. They tried another neighborhood. From the age of eleven Gail was regarded as incorrigible. She was "moody, quarrelsome, impudent, disobedient, negative, lazy, dirty, spiteful, and stupid." Her father and stepmother, however, treated her kindly, watched her closely, denied themselves necessities to pay for her music lessons. They were strict, but never impatient. When Gail was brought to court for running away, it was shocking to see her cold dislike, her positive, matured, unchildlike resolve to escape from these gentle, bewildered parents. It was as if some stream long shut up had suddenly spilled over the dam. It was quiet but invincible. She said they were too old, she could not bear to have them handle her. She would rather sleep in the hen house than with her stepmother. She simply *hated* them both. That was at the age of thirteen.

Fourteen months later the court faced the same stony barrier. Gail *hated* her teachers, those kindly folk in the school who had approached her problems with knowledge and skill.

She was then placed in an excellent private family where she is to-day. Her verbal behavior has "improved," she will say of the seven-year-old son, "I hate him . . . no, I don't, I just don't like him." But this is merely a concession to public opinion. In reality Gail does not feel differently. In telling of domestic life in her new home, she said the man and wife quarreled, drank, fought, and threw corn cobs at the dinner table. This was not so much a lie as a hopeful wish, for if Mr. and Mrs. S. really

enlivened their home in such a manner, Gail knew social workers well enough to know she would not long be left there.

The relation of antagonism to sexual promiscuity.[13]

Marion Kenworthy has pointed out that the development of a *grudge* is a highly favorable condition for violation of sexual codes of morality. Thwarted at home, the girl seeks to "put herself across," by using the only means readily available, her physical attraction.[14]

Those who seek to regulate morals "by ordering and forbidding," to use Thomas' phrase, should inquire into the state of mind of those who offend. Preoccupation with petty grievances against parents, distress because one parent undermines the status of the other, are predisposing causes for laxity in sexual behavior, which like religion, is so largely a matter of one's emotional relationship to the family.

J. was a seventeen-year-old girl. She is tall and broad with a brisk graceful walk. Her short hair is dark red. She would have graduated from high school at the age of sixteen, but left at the end of her third year to be married. Since she was nine she has worked in various families for her board and room. Her parents separated when she was two

[13] Mildred Overholtzer, M.A., has been studying cases of adolescent girls who are sexually promiscuous. Her findings indicate that unsatisfactory family relationships, rather than physical or mental abnormality, prevent young people from acceptance of standard behavior codes. Her results will shortly be available in mimeographed report: 1030 Citizens National Bank Bldg., Los Angeles, California.

[14] Kenworthy, Marion, M.D.: "The Mental Hygiene of Illegitimacy." National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 370 Seventh Ave., New York City.

years old. She was adopted by her paternal grandparents. They were well-to-do. Her brief childhood was cut short by the death of her grandmother. J. was sent to her father's sister in Montana, where she worked like a ranch hand. She wrote to her mother, whom she had hardly seen, to tell her how unhappy she was. The trouble was due to the fact that her boy cousin got all the privileges and she did all the work. The mother suggested that she run away.

At one other crisis in her life J. wrote to her mother. She had met the first boy she was really interested in. He was a sailor. They tried to get a marriage license, but could not, on account of her age. The mother signed the necessary papers. The sailor went back to the fleet. J. got work and again supported herself. She drifted from place to place, following the fleet, meeting gay young girls and their friends. She had lovers, if one may so call those careless young men, but she never became commercial. The Juvenile Court gathered her in almost accidentally. She was placed in a working-girls' club. She left the next day.

When she was caught, after two weeks of sordid promiscuity, she explained: "When I am ordered to do a thing, I usually want to do the opposite. For instance, Miss X. took me to the cafeteria and said: 'There is a job. You must keep it.' I instantly disliked it."

The court went into the matter thoroughly. The mental examinations had shown a superior degree of mentality, a resourceful, well-balanced personality. She showed exceptional skill with little children; she knew how to amuse them; if one got hurt or angry, she would pick him up and play with him until he

thought of something else. She could swim in the ocean as well as the plunge, was on all the ball teams at school, could go into the field and catch a horse and ride without saddle or bridle. She was an expert cook and did all kinds of sewing. She was very fond of reading. She spoke two languages fluently, and if she studied a lesson once, she recited it ably. Physically her condition was sound. She had never been sick. She moved about quickly and energetically. However, she had a very weak handshake.

Her father was well educated. He was a vigorous man and had made a success in the lumber business. As soon as he remarried, he knew it was a mistake. The woman had a high temper. He would have cared for J. himself after the divorce, but his parents wished to adopt her. Then he married a trained nurse. J. had always wanted to be a trained nurse. But not this kind—a coarse woman with no interests except driving the Cadillac. From this time on the father never wrote to J. nor sent her a gift on Christmas or birthday. On the whole, J. had only one clear impression of her father; he was always talking against her mother.

Her mother remarried also. The stepfather owned two saw mills, and the mother had two cars of her own to drive. The mother really wished J. to live with her, but there were two obstacles: whenever it was proposed, J. remembered that her mother was always talking against her father, and there was the added difficulty that all her father's relatives felt they had a prior legal right in that they considered the mother not respectable. To be sure she had never violated a law, but she lived in a different manner.

It was the paternal grandmother who spoiled everything for J. by dying of a heart attack after she had worked for a week to make a state convention a success. She was a leader in church, lodge, club and neighborhood, the only human being on earth who seemed to feel deeply concerned about J. After her death, the grandfather married a woman who was jealous of J. because she and her grandfather were close friends. Besides this, she was an "insincere Christian Scientist," who did not "practice what she professes to believe," as J. put it, adding: "I hate hypocrisy in religion. My own grandmother was very religious but she lived up to all that she preached."

With these facts in mind the court felt justified in trying to find some resting place for J. other than a correctional school. A home was found, a typical, kindly, normal, respectable American home. Two weeks J. "stuck it out," then she disappeared. The foster-family had no complaint save that, on the Sunday before she left, she asked to go to church. (It was the first time she had been out. They tried to take her to the beach, but she refused; she did not wish the risk of meeting "an old pal" in these humiliating circumstances. They tried to get her to take their little girl to the show; doubtless the grim specter of being overwhelmed by desire to run away prevented her from accepting this simple pleasure.) They said she could go to church, and she returned in the afternoon looking, as they put it, "doped or drunk." (J. did not use either of these doubtful roads to emotional release.) She took nothing, not even her nightgown, nor the rings, money and jewelry left scattered about in the careless fashion common to American households. The children

cried when she did not come back; otherwise J. left the respectable world just as she had entered it; she had lived in it as in a foreign country, absorbing nothing and giving nothing.

In her volume of Robert Service's poems this letter was found:

"My dear friend B.

"L. came over to-day to see me. I do not know how she ever got my address but leave it to her —she got it. She was released Thursday. Words cannot express my joy when I saw her.

"I expect you are enjoying home life again. I hope you are not dissatisfied.

"Now that the three of us are out of trouble I hope we can stay out until we can get together again, but let's hope it is not in Los Angeles nor anywhere in Calif. If ever I disliked a state it is this one. No more California for me once I get out.

"C. will be back soon, now, and I don't know if I'll see him or not. I surely think a lot of him. I received a letter from him after I was released. He said he still cared for me more than I'd ever know. He has had an operation since they went North. (Poor old Dear.)

"I am working in quite a nice place. This family consists of two children, both girls, one is ten and the other three. Boy, talk about obstinate children—they beat all I ever saw.

"Remember, B., the first time we were in Juvenile Hall and that nite we were singing and we ended up crying? I sure used to get the blues terrible. To-nite I've got the blues, too. They played "She was Just a Sailor's Sweetheart" to-

nite over the radio and of course I cried and so on. It's tough to be all alone and blue.

"Gee, L. surely must have been determined to find me. I cannot imagine how she could get it. She is a swell girl. You know . . . just my speed.

"I was in Court again Wednesday. My girl friend, the one I was arrested with at first, is in trouble again in San Diego. Now she is blaming me for everything she has done down there and I was in Juvenile Hall most of that time and her step-dad told a lot of lies about me and I've had to prove my innocence. They may have me back at J. H. before long, again. Here's hoping that they don't.

"Well, I don't know any news only that I am still on the 'water wagon.' Isn't that astounding?

"Of course you know I'm living in *Hollywood*. Now don't get evil minded. So is L. I haven't ventured to get acquainted with any of these Hollywood 'shieks' yet but I think I will, just to get a thrill. Hot ziggety!!!!???

"Well, I guess I'll close now. Please excuse this fancy stationery, but I have not been up town to get any stationery let alone anything else.

"Watch your step and don't take any wooden nickels. Don't do anything I would not do.

"Don't forget to write and tell me your plans.

"Lots of love.

"A lonesome pal,

"J."

Here we enter J.'s true world. It is almost an act of violence to read this letter without J.'s consent. It is taking advantage of a chance opportunity to

enter the country without a passport. J.'s probation officer had often noticed that as J. talked she threw her left hand in a sheltering gesture over her right shoulder. There was a butterfly tatooed there. That unconscious gesture symbolized J.'s whole contact with this world that was trying to make her good. That butterfly, put on in a mood of carefree exhilaration, could be displayed proudly to friends, to any one indeed who could understand, but it must be hidden while she was "making good." So it was with each word, look, and act. The frank and honest J. had had to conceal with tremendous effort all that seemed to her natural and spontaneous. On the other hand she had to assume everything that she was not. How different with L., B., and C.! There were exacting moral standards in that world too, loyalty to friends. "Thou shalt not bear false witness," ability to cheer up friends with the blues, resourcefulness, speed, pity, irony, and daring.

Day-dreaming, phantasy, and lying as the accompaniments of antagonism.

All children live in day-dreams. We win them forth by pointing out the fascinations of reality. Sometimes objective interests seem to grow in the child spontaneously. When the real world and the dream-world touch each other at some points, the one enriches the other. The parent often, by skilled manipulation of the child's imagination, is able to attach emotional value to prosaic objects. But where the child feels antagonism to parents, so that the reality is crushing, and objective facts become too unwielding and too utilitarian, the child repairs the damage by taking refuge in phantasy.

Antagonism in the child develops partly as a feel-

ing of irritation at being interrupted while repairing an unsatisfactory world. The child is further hampered in finding an outlet by being an inferior, always supposed to be on duty. Instead of the relief a man may get in a fiery outburst if some nagging woman breaks in on his work, the child accumulates a slow stream of rancor, suspicion, and ill will. Antagonism is a growth that matures slowly underground. When some children say: "We would rather die than go home," they mean, "We would rather live in our phantasy country, seated on a dungeon floor, than go home where you people not only are not lovable, but keep interrupting and pretending to understand our thoughts when you do not."

There was only one place where Esther made no complaint; that was the detention home. She is the daughter of a school teacher. Her father is dead. The mother, Mrs. H., to keep Esther young, and under her control, insists that she is two years younger than she really is. This irritates Esther very much because she says that she wants to do the same things that girls of her own age do, and she has the same desires, but her mother insists upon keeping her a little girl. Esther does not like school. She is capable of "college work," but she prefers to dream. "She has a great passion for reading; she would rather do this than anything in the world; she is rather inclined to feel above her immediate surroundings and is quite unwilling to do ordinary kinds of work, and wants to be a lawyer."

Esther's father was a lawyer. Esther in her diary reveals the fact that she worships him.

She liked the detention home for the same reason soldiers sometimes like the army; she knew what

was expected, there were no decisions, and there were periods off duty:—in non-institutional, or civilian life, so to speak, people were always interrupting. If you looked out the window, they said: "What are you looking at?" If you were silent they said: "What are you mad about now?"

In the detention home Esther's chief occupation was day-dreaming. The trouble "on the outside" was that her dream world was continually being spoiled by intruders. She was like an artist who is trying to paint a picture and is annoyed and harrassed by interruptions. It may have been a little unfair to Esther but the map of her dream-country was pilfered from her when she was off guard. A social worker, skilled in such occupation, obtained it from snatches of talk, diaries, letters, reveries, and a story Esther wrote about another "little girl whose mother was allowed to bring her up as she pleased."

The phantasy which came to light by these means was built around a mother, extremely beautiful, rich, easy in manner and loving. Her father was also beautiful and loving, a dark slim Spanish beauty; he was always being raided by the police for loose conduct and was successful in outwitting and outriding them. In this home there were shy, stolen kisses from fascinating parents, life under high pressure, excitement, parties, deeds of adventure, exquisite clothes in strong colors, carelessness, generosity, and speed.

Nothing could have been more remote from this phantasy than the humdrum world Esther was supposed to live in. Her own parents were sordid, neglectful and selfish; her mother aged, unattractive, strict, exacting, unpleasant to caress, lacking in

imagination, geared too slow for any flights, timid and unsophisticated.

All of Esther's lies center around this dream. Only by study of her lies, and her diary, can we understand her.

Surface incidents that cause antagonism.

As in preventive medicine we have long known that little neglected bodily ills predispose the body to disease, so in the field of mental health we are learning that petty discords cannot safely be allowed to accumulate. Many parents pride themselves on a happy home life because there is no open catastrophe. Let the circumstances change ever so little and the peace and security of the home are swept away. A mother was applying for state aid on behalf of herself and a fourteen-year-old daughter. The mother and father were divorced. He had been paying for the support of the child until stricken with tuberculosis. When the girl came before the court she flatly refused to go home. The mother appeared greatly relieved. "That suits me. Now I can go out and work. There is never any peace for me as long as Elsie is at home." Elsie admitted she was trying and impudent. She admitted bad language. "Why do you talk to your mother this way?"

"Well, anybody would—I can't be insulted. She once called me a huzzy." Elsie was a robust girl with yellow curls hanging around her shoulders. She was eager to go to her new "boarding home." "Just ask my mother one thing," she pleaded with the court, "ask her to let me cut my hair." The mother said she would never consent. The girl began to cry. "She wants to put me into the movies

—she thinks I am some Mary Pickford—but I'd crack the camera." The mother flushed. "You may do what you please with this girl. It is true I would like to see her in the movies, and I have taken pride in her appearance, but she is no daughter of mine." That afternoon the probation officer took the girl out for a hair-cut, and she returned radiant with a "sweetheart bob." It may sadden some mothers to know that she is amply contented in her new home. It is not so much the hair. The mother had married late in life. She had become an "old maid" before her child was born. Petty discords over hair, clothing, table manners, and other trifles had dissolved the bonds between mother and daughter before the court consented to the separation.

Antagonism does not usually exist in homes where father, mother, and two or three children live and work together. It flourishes in broken homes, among children of divorced parents, children who have been adopted, and is frequently found in an only child of aged parents. Fussiness and anxiety on the part of the mother are predisposing causes. Emotional tensions which block the flow of affection and make the mother uncomfortable lessen her value as a giver of comfort. "Comfortable" mothers do not have antagonistic children.

Outside interference is another source of danger. After the death of a husband a woman turns easily to a brother, uncle, guardian, or adult male friend for advice. Children resent this even when the relationship is no closer than that of friendly counselor. When the mother of a girl of seventeen consulted an elderly friend about her oil investments, the girl pleaded with her mother to put him out of the house. He continued to come and took a lively in-

terest in all the concerns of the household. The girl eloped with a man who had not received his final decree of divorce. The mother filed a petition to bring the girl to the attention of the court and insisted that she be sent to the state school until twenty-one. Mother and daughter plunged into civil warfare. The mother sold the girl's clothes and the diamond ring her lover had given her. The daughter instituted suit to have her mother removed as guardian of the estate. She was successful. A house servant was employed as a detective by the mother to watch the girl. The break was complete. In this case the girl was sufficiently mature to start life on her own account. Her antagonism did not extend to other individuals or groups.

Clarice is sixteen. She is bitterly antagonistic to both parents and refuses to live with either of them. She is a tight-lipped, self-contained young person. For a time it seemed that she would succumb to a "crush" on a woman neighbor to whom she went for comfort and for gossip on the shortcomings of her parents. But this infatuation passed harmlessly and fruitlessly. Clarice is earning her living as a school girl in a private family. She is hard working, conscientious, one has nothing to complain of in her unless it be an invincible self-righteousness. She is an only child. Only children suffer not only from too much adult attention but from too much leisure to devote to their own emotional difficulties. Clarice's parents differed over religion. The father was a member of a "recognized" church; the mother became devoted to a new sect. They argued incessantly. Clarice became for both the never-dying conscience. She weighed them and came to the conclusion they were both wrong. Unconsciously they

had permitted and encouraged their daughter to assume the rôle of judge and arbiter. Her childhood ended abruptly. Parental differences in religion may be devastating to a child if they become the main theme of family life.

Jane is a rebel against all authority. She comes from a long line of military ancestors. Her mother died when Jane was eight and she was raised by an indulgent maternal grandmother. Jane is vivacious and pretty. Her grandmother returned her to her father when she reached her 'teens. She was too much of a problem. She flirted with undesirable young men, sailors, park-loungers, and taxi drivers. She did not care for correct society. Her father had remarried a hard-working young school teacher and had four children. This home was unbearable to Jane. She ran away and became seriously delinquent. Her father gave her a hard whipping. From that time on Jane became a dangerous character. She is saturated with hate. She corrupts younger children, takes the joy out of life when she is with girls of her own age, bears tales between adults, spreads gloom and disloyalty wherever she goes. She has no close friends. Her influence is peculiarly sinister in that she disrupts any social group in which she is placed. Even strong-minded individuals appear to lose energy and begin to question the worthwhileness of their efforts when Jane is around. Jane is very unhappy but she derives some satisfaction from observing her destructive influence at work. After some catastrophe she appears flushed with excitement and more self-confident.

The elements in her situation appear to be as follows:

An ever-present, much-talked-of family tradition

of military prestige and honor. This tradition stressed deeds of gallantry among the male members of the family and charm among the women. The only exception was the case of Jane's mother who died before she was thirty, and for some reason was disliked by her own mother, and considered childish, flighty, and unworthy by her husband. After her death she was never mentioned to Jane except occasionally by the earnest young stepmother who cautioned Jane "not to be like her mother."

The family status had decayed under modern conditions. Economic pressure, coupled with change of public opinion about military glory, caused the family to live in the past and to judge the present harshly. When Jane reached adolescence the modern world offered her only the cheapest thrills and attractions. When she responded to them she became a disgrace and scandal, and there followed the use of violence by her father in correcting Jane and the infliction of humiliation. The inevitable result is the growth of a warped personality.

Of all the conditions favorable to the development of antagonism the infliction of humiliation ranks first. Ridicule, sarcasm, petty slights, the meeting of emotional warmth with coldness and misunderstanding, the tactless reprimand, appear trivial as weighed against the balance of a home life which may contain a well-ordered household, earnest behavior codes, and the satisfaction of material wants. But the child, particularly the child deprived of the companionship of other children, nurses these humiliations in lonely hours, feeds them with dreams and reveries until they become large and absorbing grudges. If antagonism began and ended in the home, it would be a small problem, but it extends to

all other forms of human intercourse and constitutes the most baffling of social problems—a warped personality, incapable of integration (at least in the present state of our knowledge) with any social group.

Some practical suggestions to parents.

It is well to remember that undesirable conduct tends to become fixed when a *reprimand* is uttered. We do not know by what stages impulsive ideas arise. But in some children, who are extraordinarily sensitive, the rebuke is a kind of focus from which everything tends to become distorted. The child suffers miserably, but he continues to do the interdicted thing as if he could not help it.

Often the parent appears to desire *perfection* in manners, and in the care of material objects. He cannot bear a scratch on his car, nor the disarrangement of the home. If the child lays the fire-logs wrongly, or misplaces a chair, or leaves his things about, the parent reacts with intense irritation. The child builds up the feeling he is awkward. He loses his sense of rhythm. The search for perfection is admirable; we cannot have too much of it. But why are these people who desire the maximum of comfort in their living arrangements so often blind to the harmonies of human relationships? It is true that the table set correctly contributes to the wellbeing of the home, but suppose the child, on being carelessly rebuked, develops an unconquerable aversion to family life! What can replace his satisfaction on being unhampered? What can the father and mother do to regain his lost allegiance?

The parent who insists that all the child's companions are common or vulgar may find that the

child develops not a fine discrimination of taste, but a blind rebellion to authority, as such.

Other factors may be listed: unsuitable clothing (failure to react to the standards of the community). If the child is dressed in a "conspicuous" manner, through too strict ideas, the child may refuse to go to parties, or even to school, and the resulting isolation will react against the parents. Religious differences, behavior codes out of harmony with the community, the ill-health of one or both parents, ambitions of parents not in harmony with their children's abilities, and the projection of these ambitions upon the children,[15] the growth of incongruous ideas of family prestige, the fact that the child has reason to be ashamed of the material surroundings of the home, the unwise use of corporal punishment even when "mild," the child resenting slapping unless the temperament of the parent is such that the child can readily "forgive," temper-tantrums and other infantile displays on the part of the parent, the wrong interpretation of innocent acts, and a tense, anxious emotional attitude that makes physical contact or caresses repellent. Humiliation in discipline is so monstrous a cause for antagonism that it should be always avoided by the wise parent.

Antagonism resolved.

Whether or not social treatment will be effective may depend on the length of time the antagonism has been present. Is it periodical, or is it a slow current, constantly affecting the whole family life?

[15] Young, Kimball, Ph.D.: "Parent-Child Relationship. Projection of Ambition; paper read at a meeting of the American Sociological Society at St. Louis," Dec. 30, 1926. Printed in *The Family*, Vol. VIII, No. 3, May 1927, pp. 67-73.

In all the cases studied, antagonism had been present over two years, the longest being of six years' duration. Four cases showed antagonism in early childhood, slowly developing until the assistance of the court was sought.

What happens when the child is removed from home? The following dispositions have been made of the twelve cases: four girls are in neutral homes, only three have been returned to their own homes, the rest are under the care of the court in boarding school or social agencies. When the child is removed she usually gains a proper perspective, attains more tolerance and understanding and comes to the conclusion that her parents were probably acting in her best interests. The parents, on the other hand, usually say they have been too strict, and are lacking in sympathy and comprehension of the situation. We may conclude that early separation is wholesome; with but two exceptions, antagonism has decreased following this modern sort of divorce.

Why can we not learn from animals? As some one has observed, "The mare that kicks away the foal should not be called a bad mother."

The mother cat is a good mother. For several weeks all the time not given to licking her fur, eating and staring, goes to the kitten with intense satisfaction to both. Then comes a day when the maternal paw strikes out in earnest, and the lubberly, overgrown kitten is given to understand that this cuff is no interchange of pleasantries. If he does not take himself off there are menacing growls and mutterings. His nursing days are over. No cat ever had a mother-complex. But this beneficent arrangement whereby among animals when the young no longer *need* mothering the mother ceases to mother, cannot

be called in any human sense antagonism as we find it between parent and child. With animals the relationship has ceased to exist. There is no compromise, and no aftermath of yearning for its re-establishment.

In human beings antagonism is a kind of instinctive reaction from too close an association. As with those friends who care deeply for one another certain curious situations arise when the very closeness of their sharing causes strange outbursts of hatred, so with parent and child come periods of need for "aloneness." The wise parent, at such times, ceases to be a parent. He does not presume on his blood-relationship: he waits until resentment is past. He knows, by reason of his great love, when to draw close, and when to depart.

CHAPTER VIII

LEADERSHIP: PARENTS AND FRIENDS

THE present inquiry seeks to set out clearly a problem which is extremely baffling to human beings who are parents, or who are entrusted with the guidance of others. What has happened when a child is influenced by some one outside the family to think, do, become otherwise than he would have done without this influence? Comparatively few parents are concerned with the reverse side of this problem: how shall we produce "leaders"? Leadership to most parents presents itself as an ebb-tide which draws their children into unauthorized places while they are off guard.

The sociologist, viewing the family, emphasizes its solidarity: it is a social group, united for common ends, having a joint task, and a joint means of expression.[1] Out of the common task and struggle flow the recognition of the family by the community, and the loyalty of the individual. What has occurred when a child, previously submissive, turns his attention to a personality "outside," forgoes his allegiance, engages in activities and interests of which the parents disapprove? To the parent it looks like a sinister undermining. Is it true that this "leadership" is due to the new personality, who appears to call to the child, like the Pied Piper of Hamelin, or is it the result of some break-down in the family and in the social situation?

[1] Lindeman, Eduard.

What shall the parents do about it? Shall they wall their children up? Shall they use force, or seek to adjust to the new seduction, or to outwit it? Or shall they try remedy in the courts, like misguided husbands and wives who start suits against those whom they deem to have "alienated the affections" of the one they have "possessed"?

From the outset parents must realize that in facing the problem of their children's friends they are confronting the most mysterious forces in human experience. They are meeting loyalty. The building up and the destruction of loyalty taps the central force with which human beings work to build or to destroy all their social structures. To tamper with loyalty is to play with the naked roots of good and evil. The wisest men of religion, the greatest among statesmen tremble before touching anything so vital to human welfare; how much more should parents pause when they undertake the guidance of their children's friendships.

The problem presented to Juvenile Courts in dealing with "bad companionship."

In almost every Juvenile Court hearing in a case of joint-delinquency, something like this happens: "The entire blame rests on X.; remove her (or him) and we can handle the situation." This is said by parents, teachers, and social workers. It is leveled at every type of intelligence, the feeble-minded, sub-normal, normal, and genius; it is said of those who are younger than the one "led," and those older, of the attractive and the hideous, of the skilled and stupid; of the honest, traitorous, kindly, and malicious; of sturdy, jolly, integrated personalities, and those whose lives have been darkened by

fear, hate, envy, greed or suspicion. In short any kind of individual may be picked out as the one who exercised an undue influence, a leadership over a child who but for this contact was "normal."

Those who sit in judgment tend to brush aside these complaints. Knowing how human it is to hunt for witches, how economical we all are of intelligence, preferring to make the first stop on the road and to blame the first thing we encounter, as a *cause,* rather than to seek to untangle the complexities of innumerable forces that baffle us, the average unbiased judge minimizes the alleged responsibility of those accused of causing the missteps of another. How could a single individual wield so much power? Why attribute a runaway, elopement, riot, offense, or obscenity participated in by many to the "leadership" of one person? Gradually, however, the impression grows: may there not be something to it? Are there outstanding personalities who operate in their communities as dynamic centers of energy, "causing" things to happen that would not have occurred were they silenced, or removed? It is an age-old question which only the impertinent curiosity of our minds at the present time leads us to ask again. How much effect do personalities have on situations? We see constructive and destructive results of which the chief factor seems to be the leadership of an energetic human being. Bertrand Russell has said: "We construct when we produce a predesigned structure, and we destroy when we liberate natural forces to alter an existing structure without being interested in the resulting new structure." But this definition tells us nothing of the kinds of persons who love to build, or to wreck, nor why their interest on the one hand is creative and on the other

antagonistic. Viewing the fearful destructiveness we see to-day, homes broken, minorities trampled underfoot, communities in strife, it is easy to feel that "natural forces" may exist which are inherently evil, cruel and malicious, and that persons who use their abilities to destroy are the embodiments of these. Thus it has appeared to some thoughtful men of religion, even though they have discarded a belief in demons or in the devil. Shakespeare, Masefield, Melville and Conrad are saturated with the idea that a ruthless and monstrous destructiveness is afoot in the world, working through living creatures.

But when we become calm we are not satisfied with such an explanation. We are interested in the childhood of these destroyers and builders. By what process of education, in what relationship to parental authority, did they learn the attitudes and habits of leadership?

Case studies of adolescent girl leaders.[2]

This study was undertaken in "an attempt to understand the nature and significance of personality relationships in the production of anti-social attitudes and conduct." Delinquent girls under the care of the Los Angeles Juvenile Court were chosen as the material for research, for the problem of the court is the problem of the parent. "As a 'super-parent' it is the responsibility of the court as well as of the community in general to know something of the forces that are at work in determining matters of influence, 'prestige,' attraction, and admiration among young people—for these are the things which

[2] Brown, Sibyl Clement, M.A.: "The Problem of Leadership Among Adolescent Girls." University of Southern California, December, 1926.

lead ultimately to habits of conduct generally social, or anti-social in character."

The method of study was similar to that of the cases of antagonism between parents and children. About twenty-five girls conspicuous for their being held responsible for the troubles and misdeeds of their contemporaries were selected. Of these six were finally chosen for intensive study and observation. The results were then compared with a study of the six outstanding girl leaders in a large city high school.[3]

The ways in which delinquent girl leaders exercise their leadership.

The night clerk of a hotel has been summoned to court and is annoyed. What are all these women fussing about? "Yes—Miss Johnson came to my hotel. No, I didn't know she was having boys in her room. I can't watch the company of tenants." It irritates him to stop in the midst of his work to answer these useless questions and it infuriates him to breathe this atmosphere of moral disapproval. It is clear that all the adults in the court think he is a guilty person. And so he is under the contributing law which declares that any adult who commits any act or omits the performance of any duty, which act or omission shall cause or tend to cause a person under twenty-one to come before the Juvenile Court, may be charged with contributing to the delinquency (or dependency) of a minor.

But why did *Miss* Johnson—who is Elsie Johnson, just fifteen—leave her home and go to the hotel?

[3] This study was undertaken by Nell Hendrik, a social worker of Los Angeles, engaged in research. The illustrations and conclusions of this chapter are largely based on the results of the work of Miss Brown and Miss Hendrik.

The question arises at what point in the long chain of cause and effect shall we stop? Is there something in Elsie's family life "performed or omitted" that tends to make her particularly susceptible to the allurements of a cheap rooming house? Her mother cannot understand it. "She always took my judgment in everything, even about her clothes, until she met Bertha. Now she won't listen. She left home to be with Bertha."

The school authorities sum it up as follows: "Bertha is the worst girl in the neighborhood. There is always a crowd of young people around her. She does nothing in school. If you remove that girl, we can handle the rest."

Who is this girl who creates fuss where no fuss was, who needs only to crook her finger and a girl of good family, who has been obedient to parents, leaves her home, ignores her family traditions, abandons her friends and follows her?

She is a fifteen-year-old girl, flashily dressed, rather over-size, fairly pretty, vivacious, smiling, good-natured, of average, that is to say, mediocre intelligence. She comes from a broken home. She left school at the eighth grade, has worked occasionally as a waitress.

One girl, on her advice, contracted an early disastrous marriage. Bertha arranged everything, loaned clothes, hid the runaway bride in her home, went with them to the license bureau, where she had no difficulty in posing as the older sister. She "had a way with her" that disarmed the suspicions of the clerk. She could cash a check in any store, or bank, rent a car without security, start a charge account; in short, she was skilled in making use of the human beings who controlled the social resources she wished

to use. She was unknown to librarians, settlement workers, leaders of clubs, churches, extension classes and playgrounds, but very well known to soft drink parlors, skating rinks, and dance halls. The only social agencies that knew her were the day nursery, when, as a child of three, her mother went out to work, and the Juvenile Court, which took charge of her when she was thirteen. She escaped commitment because nothing real could be proved against her. The others, her friends, were in more serious trouble. When she came to court her flashing smile and ready acceptance of the point of view of her probation officer always succeeded in winning another chance. Even the mother of Elsie admitted that Bertha had not persuaded her daughter to leave home; Elsie had gone "just to be near her."

Rose is another "delinquent" girl leader. She is now sixteen. Her "leadership" is evidenced in the fact that wherever she goes she plans what the crowd does. The crowd consists of both boys and girls. It is not an organized gang; it is constantly changing. Rose arouses no passionate loyalties, no one trusts her very much, but she has great influence over one girl in particular—Florence.

Florence is seventeen. She lives with her mother and father and four brothers and sisters in a good neighborhood. Florence is the youngest girl in her family. She is far more intelligent than Rose, has finished the third year high school and dropped out because of indifference. She has been carefully brought up; in fact, never permitted to go anywhere alone. She met Rose at school. Shortly afterward she began slipping out of her window at night. At first they went to church. They would wait until the young people's services were over, then join a

group en route to the soft drink parlor, or sometimes they would attend a church party. Afterward there would be trips to the beach in automobiles. Florence, whose manner was always listless, began to take on more color. She was timid and it frightened her to be deceiving her parents, but when she was with Rose she felt courage. The vigor and boldness of that young person had an invincible attraction. Rose had with adults a combination of pleasing manners and rudeness that never failed to open doors. She appeared to know so much about the adult world, she had learned some of its habits, like drinking, smoking and swearing, was unusually skilled in repartee, she knew just what to say to traffic officers, policemen, dance-hall proprietors, restaurant keepers, gay young men with cars, and no one could silence a shocked neighbor as quickly as Rose could.

Even when Rose's leadership somehow resulted in bringing Florence before the court, Florence felt she had gained more than she lost.

"It was so dull at home. I just felt that I must get out, whatever happened. That was the reason we went to church. I enjoyed getting out at night and I would do the same thing over again only I would be more careful what happened."

In other matters Florence showed indecision. She was so eager for approval, so sensitive to criticism. She said in court—"I tried to take my boy-friend home but the girls teased me about it." She gave the impression of yielding limply to disapproval. It astonished her parents to learn that their obedient youngest daughter, mild, tractable and fearful of incurring their displeasure, had shown such complete disregard of the moral instruction of a life-

time. "How did she dare?" said the mother. It was obvious that Florence had transferred her interest from what her family thought of her to what her contemporaries thought. A soldier does not find happiness in what his home town thinks about his bravery unless that opinion is shared by his fellow-soldiers. A professional man takes no comfort in popular favor if he is despised by the members of his scientific society. It so happened that Rose's standards of conduct were shared by most of the young people and many of the adults in Florence's neighborhood. Her family could not approve these standards. They had been caught in an engulfing tide of "civilization" that had changed their community from a little group of homes to a "thriving" city street, with filling stations, hot-dog stands, movies and stores, a miserable lot of buildings, most of which looked as if they had been "just put up for the night," but were viewed with pride at the booster-meetings.

Florence's father went to these, but it never occurred to him, nor to the other members of the family to find fault with the neighborhood: the mother who stayed at home, belonging to no clubs, the married daughter who had moved away, the daughter next to Florence who was a successful business woman and ashamed of Florence for her dropping out of school and her listless indifference to clothes, nor to the two brothers, one a studious, retiring high school boy, the other a hard-working mechanic, each had his place in some group, save Florence. It bored them to take Florence out; long ago the family stopped taking recreation together. There was never any reading, music or games. Florence's sisters had each had a brief blossoming period, at

which time the parents had shown affection and interest. How difficult it is for parents to have the skill which gives equal growth-opportunities to all the children, and as one flourishes, does not crowd the others into the background.

Rose's family was quite different. Her father was dead. She had one younger brother, aged thirteen. Her mother had been a foster-child, overworked all her life. Rose's father had been a defeated man. After a troubled boyhood, he escaped from the bullying of seventeen older brothers and sisters and a tyrannical father, came west, and married a woman nine years younger than himself. He let his wife earn the living and devoted himself to the children. He read to them, and took interest in their school work. When Rose was twelve, he died of tuberculosis. Rose used to stand looking at his picture on the mantelpiece, but said very little. Then she began to be truant from school. She built bonfires in caves with the boys, cooked meals out of doors, played ball. Her prestige had a long history. When she was a little child she could always stay out an hour or so longer than the other children. She was taller and stronger, had more toys and spending money. The toys had been constructed by her father, the money was given by her mother, who was trying to make her daughter's childhood different from her own bitter foster-child memories. These advantages and privileges gave Rose a superior position in the neighborhood. With adolescence came still more. Her mother permitted her to come and go as she pleased. Her dress was the shortest and tightest, her lips the reddest, of any of the school children.

When the teachers remonstrated with the mother,

she said the neighbors "told her things," but she didn't know anything "against the girl." Occasionally the things the neighbors told her so infuriated her that she beat Rose. The school authorities regarded Rose as a nuisance. She made the other children restless. The principal, an old man, said "that girl ought to have been put in the penitentiary long ago." Before she was fifteen two other groups had repudiated her—she was fired from her job in the five-and-ten-cent store as sales girl during the Christmas holidays because she wore too much paint, and she was ejected from a church party because she was a "roughneck."

The mother became more exhausted from her work. Rose became a rebel both from home and school. She had no responsibility for anything. Her personality took on a certain cheerfulness, optimism and courage. She had a keen sense of humor. She developed the habit always of shifting the blame to some one else. She was skilled in lying and exaggeration. She would never refuse to take a dare. Once she would have jumped off an ocean pier in her clothes, because some boys dared her.

During an unexpected early morning call, Rose was found by her probation officer bare-footed and without stockings, lounging around the kitchen in which the dirty dishes were piled. Rose seemed at great pains to conceal a small cherub tatooed on her right calf: "I did it on a dare, Miss X., I'm kind of ashamed of it now," said Rose.

She could drive any make of car, had amazing skill at thinking up exciting things to do. She took the boys and girls to an old barge anchored in the harbor, planned wienie bakes, taught the young people to give false names and addresses when con-

fronted. She was generous, affectionate and large-hearted, in short, a remarkably well-adjusted personality—adjusted, that is, to the needs of her group. She was what we call an "integrated" personality, in marked contrast to Florence, who was ill at ease, retiring, fearful and unhappy, and "disintegrated." Rose sang well, was an expert swimmer, possessed an inexhaustible fund of dramatic ability, always imitating, posing, and caricaturing. Her popularity was enhanced by her ability to defy adults. It was greatly enhanced by one or two items of newspaper publicity which appeared when she ran away. But the thing which made her "crowd" grow was the sinister gossip of the adult neighborhood. A girl who was seen with her instantly became "tough," and the process of exclusion which made Rose a stranger to school, work, church and respectable recreation groups, operated swiftly against the newcomer.

Her own group however had its equally effective organ of approval and disapproval. "Sissy," "goofy," "teacher's pet," "false alarm," "mamma's darling," or "good sport," "jazz-baby," and like terms were the overt expressions of a subtle, widespread "language" which embraced or rejected the young people in search of a good time. Many of them discovered they could not tell the truth and get along with their parents.

Rose's "leadership," then, will never be solved by testing her intelligence quotient, which is normal, or studying her health, which is perfect, or analyzing her personality; nor will its effect be ended if Rose should be sent away to the "state school." The deepest forces of social life and the family relation-

ships of all concerned enter into the simplest case of "bad companionship."

One thing may be said for these delinquent "leaders." Their leadership is careless, nonchalant, and unpremeditated. They do not want to chairman any meetings for their own aggrandizement, nor obstruct committee work because they cannot reap the glory. They lead because of the drabness of their surroundings and their own amazing vitality and play-sense put to useless uses.

Ina is the "leader" of a gang. She is sixteen. The court clinic reports her as physically in good condition. She is clinically negative for venereal infection, and has had no sex experience. Her mental age is nineteen. She has an intelligence quotient of 118 per cent, a superior girl. She loves to read Zane Grey and stories of adventure. Her favorite show is "The Covered Wagon." She likes athletic games. She is described as having "quick comprehension, an unusual vocabulary, a bit excitable, a mischievous manner, making many 'snappy remarks' on the side (a live wire). She is jolly and alert, and has a 'thoughtful attack' during mental tests."

The policewoman filed the petition in her behalf. The girl had "hiked and bummed" her way from a city three thousand miles distant. She had an assumed name. Her parents were Michael and Olive Magyar.

Ina stated that she left home on a dare made by her gang, "The Seven Devils." She made the trip in thirteen days, arriving broke, having spent twenty dollars en route.

She told the policewoman that her parents always

"picked on her," that they hate her and she does not want to return home. On her sixteenth birthday, July 30th, she left home, and got as far as Chicago, where she was picked up. Her father went after her and took her home. She was locked in a room, but escaped the next day.

Ina states that her gang consists of seven girls. They do not like the boys and the object of their gang is to cause as much trouble as possible. They usually dress in boys' clothing and pick fights with the boys. She can lick any one her own size. As leader she would sometimes plan the taking of an automobile, the girls would "pile in," flirt with girls they met on the streets, take them for a ride, and make them walk home. They would also go to a near-by town where there was an Italian dance-hall, and "most of the folks were intoxicated. So we would hold them up, throw chairs, turn out the lights, causing as much disturbance as possible." She said her gang liked to hike, swim, play ball, shoot craps, and do all the things that girls usually do not do. She said she would like to go on a ranch in Arizona, and be a cowgirl.

The police department wired Ina's father twice and did not get an answer. Finally the following arrived:

"CHIEF OF PROBATION OFFICERS,

"Dear Sir: I have received word that my daughter who ran off June 10 is held by the Probation Officers. I have not received any telegrams, but later the Post Master General acknowledged us that there was a telegram for us, stating that we send money for her return trip. I am a hard-working man and earn only four dollars a day

and have a family of eight children to support. I cannot afford these unnecessary expenses. Besides this is the second time she ran off and it cost me over forty dollars to bring her back from Springfield, Ohio. I kindly ask you that you ask my daughter Ina if she promises to be obedient, never run off again, and will want to work and stay at home, in other words to be a good girl. If she promises to be a good girl and owns up to these requirements, I will in a few days get the money required for her return trip. Please reply very soon.

"Sincerely yours,
"MICHAEL MAGYAR."

The Chief of Police in the girl's home town wrote:

"This girl has caused her parents a lot of worry. She dressed as a boy, and carried a gun. Her parents appear to be good foreign people. She has a very nice sister, who works in our office as stenographer, but she can't do anything with her. Her father has decided to let her be sent to some reform school in your state, and later, when she is released, he will send her transportation to come home, if she cares to do so.

"Her parents are anxious to learn how she got to ——, and if some one took her there, as she had no money when she left home."

To her father's letter Ina replied:

"DEAR MOTHER AND DAD:

"I had my hearing here at Juvenile Court and got to read your letter. Now you know from my telling you that I have no intention of promising

any such absurd thing as being good according to your standard ideas, or staying home either. Up till I was sixteen I swallowed all kinds of boloney you fed me just to keep from having a blowout. But I quit. Remember certain names you called me that you hadn't the least right or reason for. Maybe you thought it wouldn't hurt my feelings, but it did and since I'm not used to bawling out like most girls there was no way to show it. It will be only a waste of money to take me back and I hope you think twice before you cross the bridge.

"If these people give me a chance I'll try my best to make good and I won't go home till I can show something for my work. You must think I have no honor or self-respect. Well, I have and I don't intend to lose it by going back *now*.

"Dad, you were only sixteen when you came to the U. S. and couldn't speak English. So you see I have lots better chances of making good in my own country.

"Yours respectfully,

"INA MAGYAR."

"Constructive" leadership among normal girls.

Nothing could present a greater surface contrast to the young people who were summoned to court in Rose's case than the students of Y—— High School. This school, in a typical American neighborhood, neither rich nor poor, has about 4,000 students. Any one who has taken a catastrophic view of modern youth should meet these students. The neighborhood is stabilized. Most of the homes are owned. There are small gardens, parks and playgrounds. People have not cut down all the trees. The busi-

ness street is not very ugly, and some open fields can be reached by walking. The students are sons and daughters of everyday business, professional and laboring men and women. The community is far from ideal, but the real estate sub-divider, when he came, passed by. There was nothing to sub-divide. So there is adequate space for children to grow up in.

The high school student body activities, the churches and the families, utilize almost all the time of the young people. At Y—— school they wear no uniform, follow no cult, but instantly one gains the impression on the campus that here boys and girls live wholesomely.

There is none of that electrically charged atmosphere of "just hanging around" that was so characteristic of Rose and her crowd.

Let us observe the girl leaders of this group. We may choose them by their record of student body offices, club presidents, camp-fire organizers, etc., and by the opinions of their fellow students and teachers.

Beth, by all odds, is the most popular girl in the school. She has been vice-president of the student body, president of the Girls' League, leader in dramatics and athletics. She is pretty, but not beautiful, very well dressed with an immaculate freshness and daintiness (she makes her own clothes), her gait is light, she is always literally on tiptoe.

"Yes, Beth is the sweetest girl in the school," says Martha, who is a far better student. "She is so different and always knows the nicest things to do and has more ideas than we have."

The boys like her. Beth is no prude, but she does not "pet." She considers it something "no self-respecting girl would do." Beth is fond of using

terms like this, yet her diary reveals day-dreams of lovers, and to her grandmother, a music teacher of whom she is fond, to whom she addresses little notes which are placed under a flower pot by the girl and answered in the same fashion by the romantic old lady, Beth writes: "Bob wants to kiss me and I want him to. What must I do?" Her grandmother evidently gave her satisfying advice for the correspondence continued.

One of the boy athletes of the school says: "I always want to be at my best when I am with her." Beth's own brother is a year older, and a year more advanced in school. However, he put off his graduation a year so that he could get his diploma on the day she would receive hers.

One day Beth noticed that a group of boys and girls were getting into a borrowed automobile preparatory to "ditching school." It was driven by a popular young fellow whom all the girls sought. She descended upon this party with flashing eyes, explained the enormity of their conduct and succeeded in sending them all back to school. This identifying herself with the moral standards of the community did not prevent her, however, from absenting herself from school one day with a girl friend, and making a trip ten miles across town to register in a different high school, under an assumed name, gravely assuring the authorities that she had "just come from the East." One teacher does not like Beth: "She is extremely temperamental and I can generally tell when she comes in the room what kind of mood she is in, and how the class will go."

Beth, however, is as happy at school as she is at home. Her teachers usually report a sense of well-being when she is about. Her own ambition is to

become a teacher. She writes in her diary: "I believe that teaching little boys and girls how to become earnest, upright men and women will be nerve-wrecking, but soul-satisfying. Yet deep in my heart has always been the desire to be—oh, just for one short hour—a soda-fountain clerk."

Beth's capacity for hard work is one of her leading characteristics. After school she holds a committee meeting or two, then goes home, where she prepares supper and looks after her little sister Mary, for her mother works as a clerk away from home. Mary, aged nine, says: "I love little mother [Beth] best because she raised me, and not big mother, but she is sometimes stricter than big mother."

Beth has identified herself with the interests of her family and her family has identified itself with her success in school and with her contemporaries. Beth's mother earns about $150 per month. She is an efficient woman. At fifteen she broke away from her family, changed her religion, and, in a runaway match, married a boy of nineteen. Her husband was never a provider. The most he ever earned was $115 as a gang foreman of a telephone company. He had tried real estate, but was easily discouraged. He reads poetry and writes a little. Beth says of her father: "You have to kinda coax him along." It is clear that he turns to his daughter for appreciation, for his wife thinks him incapable. She works from morning till night while he broods, discusses religion and philosophy—in which he is something of a mystic. He can never forget the harsh discipline of his father, a preacher and farmer who raised six sons and never willingly let any of them grow up. His wife misunderstands him, but Beth listens to his poetry, thinks it is won-

derful, and, in turn, her father is her admirer. He would rather be with Beth than any one. Beth tells her father everything that happens during the day. Sometimes together they take out David, her brother of seven, who is crippled from infantile paralysis. They go to the woods and gather wild flowers. Then they return and read aloud.

Beth shares the anxiety of her parents for the doctor bills, for Tom, aged seventeen, who is rather effeminate and shy and wishes to marry a girl "just like Beth," for the upkeep of the home, the making and hanging of the new curtains, the paying of taxes and street assessments. In a real sense Beth is the pal of both father and mother. She has a latch-key, and can "wrap the whole family around her finger." She plans what they eat and wear. Yet it is evident that there are no behavior patterns laid down by her parents which Beth does not regard as sacred. Beth thinks that her mother's working away from home makes her a more adequate parent. There is certainly no antagonism in the mother-daughter relationship. If Beth resents her father's economic inferiority, she admires him, and turns to him for her ideals. She works all the harder to compensate for his lack of success in business.

In a sense the children have taken possession of the home. Both parents have a whole-hearted admiration of the children. They occupy the best bedrooms, and their plans supersede anything the parents have on hand. The parents have a unity of attitude toward the children. There has never been wrangling, jealousy, suspicion, or physical violence. There is no corporal punishment. Both parents are fond of their children and display consistent affection. What Beth knows of sex she learned within

her family. They are always talking things over, reading, playing games, and going out together on picnics, and to church. The rooms are so poorly furnished that Beth does not like to take her friends home. She keeps making little excuses. If Beth had $50 to spend, she would buy her mother a dress, a brace for her little brother, and a cage for her bird. In short there is nothing remarkable in Beth's range of ideas, nor in her family life.

If we sum it up we note that she has a confident, imperious manner, an average intelligence and normal health, that she possesses the ability to see things through, that she is witty and light-hearted, a good sport, versatile in her interests, with an attention rather evenly divided between books and indoor activities and outdoor activities, that she has an intense enjoyment of life, that she is not rebellious to her family—on the contrary, she is in complete harmony with its behavior codes—that she has great affection for her brothers and sisters and feels responsibility for them, that she has a concern for other people and an attitude of protection, a tolerance beyond her years—as one fellow student puts it: "You can tell her anything and she understands"; she has a definite plan of life and has known handicaps, but these handicaps are stimulating.

An unseen margin divides her life from that of Rose. The economic level is much the same. Beth is in harmony with the ideas of her community, she is "refined," "lady-like" and loyal—and Rose is tough, and a rebel. On the whole, Rose is a more "adjusted" personality than Beth, but this has depended largely on the community.

We must mention one factor, the presence in Beth's school of a woman vice-principal, an out-

standing personality, warm and generous, interested in what concerns young people, a woman who knows all the girls in the school personally, and who guides their social life, and feels it as a personal sorrow when a girl drops out of school. She welcomes "problem girls," and has never expelled one. She visits the court, and interests her High School Girls' League in the affairs of the city.

It is significant that none of the high school leaders studied had ever been "school problems." One girl who felt that she might have been a problem because she was acutely unhappy at school writes:

> "Then I came to Y—— High School—didn't know a soul except Arlis—hated the whole works. Mother explained to Miss X. (the vice-principal) that I wasn't as elated over Y—— school as I should have been and so she called me into the office. I was scared to death—what had I done? Never will I forget how kindly and sympathetically she spoke to me—why, she even knew my name! She made me see how marvelous Y—— School really was, unconsciously revealing her kind, lovely self and her generous warm heart."

As to family relationships, we must note also that Beth has never known the misery of a family where one parent is in charge, and the other is divorced—divorced—emotionally, if not legally, from the affairs of the home. Beth has never known a divided family allegiance. She has never lived in a neighborhood where she could gain prestige from her companions, and censure from adults, by defying adult standards—a censure that expresses itself in secret admiration, of gossip around card tables, and

a hushed expectancy of some dramatic outbreak. She has never known what it was to have to impress herself upon her companions, at all costs, by overdressing, sophistication, daring and newspaper publicity. In her home and in her school she has found ready-made channels for her initiative, charm and energy. In her home she has not only been "wanted," but she is necessary. She has learned responsibility in her family group, and while it may have brought her an over-maturity of outlook, it has provided scope for her full energy.

Beth is typical of the other girl leaders of the Y—— High School. None of them are endowed with unusual health, mentality, or family advantages —all of them are identified with their community— and have that mysterious gift of tolerance, capacity, vitality, and concern for the interests of their fellow man, that places them in the position of popular affection and influence. All of them have faced stimulating handicaps,—handicaps of working mothers, sick or economically inferior fathers, ill brothers and sisters, the necessity of careful planning, the unsatisfied emotional yearning of one parent, the pressure of respectability. Yet the balance of a healthy and invigorating family-and-school life has been maintained.

What is the task of the parent of a gifted child? First to attend to his health and normal growth, freed from adult interference or the presence of a selfish goal. Next, unmitigated common sense and sturdiness of outlook, a sense of humor, and the upholding of a worthwhile task.

One woman writes—whose boy is now in college and whose relationship to her son is noted for its cordial understanding: "How did I achieve this

confidence? By no criticism of friends, no pressure upon him for a change of view even when it hurt to see him headed wrong. I have felt and acted toward him as toward some delicately budded plant, the least touch of which would somehow mar, or retard. I have dug the roots—hard—but he never knew that. . . . I have never talked to him, nor written him a letter when I was miserable or confused myself. Just as he has shown courage in dealing with his own lack of finances or with his college mates, or love affairs, so I have never let him see the times when I, his mother, felt spiritually bankrupt. There has been utter frankness between us—yet no dependence. Now I feel that he is almost mature. I take joy in him. He is something to trust, and to lean upon—yet I shall never lean."

Such a parent is no handicap to a child about to become a leader.

There is often a certain smugness about the child leader, as there is with some club presidents. The leader attains an articulate formula of what all right-minded people ought to say and do in certain circumstances. The group assents to this, if for no other reason than that they are silenced by their own feeling of moral inferiority. Adults should exercise caution when a child displays the ability to dominate and to humiliate other children.

For example, Jane, when observed in the nursery-school, was four and a half years old. She was tall and strong for her age. She was described by her teacher as "a leader, a motherly child, inclined to lead for good." Jane was playing with a discarded roll of red celluloid film. It was old and had a few cracks which widened in the wind as Jane flew about

the yard with the film streaming behind her. It fell on the ground and a boy of three ran to pick it up. His clumsy fingers, in rolling it up, tore it a little more, but it was evident as he handed it to Jane that he believed himself helpful. The teacher came up just then in distress: "Who did this?" she said, holding up the torn object. No one minded whether the film was torn or not, but the teacher believed that this was an opportunity to teach consideration for another's property. The three-year-old evidently thought she meant who picked it up, for he answered, "I did," with promptness and satisfaction. Jane said nothing. With intense absorption she watched the teacher take the little boy's hands, pull his sweater sleeves over them in punishment and say: "Hands mustn't do that." The child was bewildered. He looked at his hands, at the teacher's face, at Jane, and the other children who crowded around. Suddenly he had become a culprit, and in the subtle way in which human affairs go, Jane, who was the "guilty party," if any one was guilty, became aggrandized, a figure of righteousness.

Later in the day all the children were in giggles. Some child had done something improper. One little boy was convulsed with laughter. Jane said: "It is not funny, is it?" looking at the teacher, then with emphasis: "My father says it is not funny."

Very early children learn that there seem to be two moralities, the morality of rules, where one gains approval and prestige by observance, and also by condemning those unable or unwilling to follow these rules; and the morality of persons, where one enters a realm of values based on liking, affection, and loyalty. Fair play, the giving of some service, the avoidance of the infliction of suffering upon

others, seem to be of more importance than following the rules. The reason children feel that the two moralities are antagonistic is because adults so frequently trample upon persons in the presence of children. It is a tragic thing for a child to be in the hands of parents or teachers who permit him to gain advantage, or to win a position of moral superiority at the cost of the ridicule, humiliation, failure, or degradation of some other child. Constantly we see this kind of "leadership" sponsored in groups of small children. We have, in truth, no one but ourselves to blame for the ruthlessness and smugness of leaders.

The price of leadership is paid by the child, no less than the adult. Sometimes the ability to hold a group together depends on behavior acquired through inhibitions growing out of deep conflict.

Isabel was president of a girls' self-government club. She took it seriously: no task was too hard, or disagreeable. She worked everything undertaken into a successful issue. She was punctual, unfailingly loyal to principle, and could not be swayed by the group. Her first election came easily because of her quaint, attractive face, and her good manners, and adequate vocabulary. Her reëlection came grudgingly: "She sure is goody-goody." "Gosh, how she preaches!" "Does she believe all that? Sure, she does." Isabel had not the slightest sense of humor. Her pronouncements from the chair on morals were devoid of the least twinkle or concession. Her low pleasing voice flowed in didactic, ministerial rhythm, unbroken by doubt, or second thought, or a sudden tug of personal affection for some sinner who might, reasonably enough, be considered an exception. Isabel was completely smug.

It could not occur to her contemporaries that this "surface" was as necessary for her protection as is the bark of the young tree when sap runs in spring. Her formula of conduct was based on the very highest principles she knew, the conventional statements of teachers and social workers. She tried to identify herself with them because she had nothing else to belong to.

Her family accused her of "acting superior" to them. She refused to ride on her father's truck through the center of town, and she wanted to go to high school and college. Her delinquencies included running away from home, truancy, temper-tantrums, and bad company (at the age of sixteen she had fallen in love with two older men). Her parents were glad to have her sent away from home. Her mother was deaf, had bad eyesight, and constant headaches. The mother's father had nine children, six of whom died before adolescence. He was a member of the Lutheran Church, but now his daughter, Isabel's mother, says she won't hear of Isabel's going to church: "It is nonsense. God is in the radio."

Isabel has always been interested in religion. Her favorite books are the Bible, "Pollyanna," and "The Reign of Terror," the last two, in a sense, being symbolic of her dual response to life.

Isabel's father comes of a long line of Swedish-Americans of healthy stock. He was considered the black sheep of a family of eight. He was a mechanic and ship carpenter. He was a good workman, but something (possibly the childish sense of guilt he still retained from the thunderings of his Lutheran father) kept him moving from place to place. Before Isabel was seven they had moved four

times. When she was nine he brought her and her little brother, aged seven, to California in an automobile and set up a giant ferris wheel on one of the pleasure piers in a beach resort. He built this with his own hands. It was a success. Isabel, dressed as a chorus girl, sold the tickets from a high platform, and the seven-year-old brother, dressed as her lover, helped her. When they were "arrested" by some child welfare agency, it was a great shock to Isabel.

Then the mother and Isabel's oldest sister joined the family and life was more stable. Still they moved seven times more before Isabel was sixteen. By the time she was eleven she was working in private homes as nursemaid. She saw bad temper, drunkenness, and immorality in these homes, but kept from serious delinquency herself, the reason being that her oldest sister had been arrested and Isabel made a resolve "not to be like her."

Isabel had no idea, when she fell in love, that it was against the law. The court hearing, and the resulting social treatment at the girls' school, made a deep impression. It was her first security, yet in conflict with all she had known. So it is that Isabel regards emotion as a disaster. She shrinks from "crushes" among the girls, yet she is always inspiring them, and herself is in the throes of adoration over one of the teachers, whose lack of reciprocity is a great sorrow.

When Isabel first went to the school a girl feigned a suicide attempt over a triangular girl love affair, with Isabel as apex. This so disturbed Isabel that she determined to have no close friends: "I said to myself, 'I shall work to be president of this club. I shall make something of myself. In order to do

that I shall be nice to every one and have no close friends.'" Months passed. Isabel won her presidency. She starved for affection, yet all that she had known had ended badly. Her formula, her articulate grasp of behavior codes, was a great help, a comfort, almost a substitute, for it brought her approval from adults who could also give security. But it was neither adequate nor subtle enough when you were flooded with emotion. Therefore emotion must be avoided. It was extremely dangerous, yet irresistible. When the psychiatrist requested her to let her thoughts go where they would in free association and reverie for the purpose of psychoanalysis, Isabel said: "My mind does not work that way. I never just drift. I control my thoughts." It is clear that she wishes to occupy herself with only those things which she thinks have purpose, "will get her somewhere," and that she is careful not to let her mind wander in unguarded regions.

This child, then, ignorant of the beneficent process of "sublimation" and possessed of superior vigor of mind, a warmth of emotion, much energy, an "impossible family situation," became a leader of a turbulent group, who chose her because she best represents their hopes toward righteousness and their leaning toward adult approval. She may be smug, but it is because her leadership is based on the energy of conflict, and her victory is still too raw to wear with a smile. Is all "leadership," we wonder, a kind of mysterious flowering of personality under handicap?

Results of the study of the "constructive" and "destructive" leaders compared.

"From the point of view of this study, which is concerned mainly with the problem of leadership *as*

related to delinquency, the divergence between the groups is of greater importance. Here the most outstanding factors may again be divided into those which characterize the social setting—the home and family background, neighborhood, school and so forth, and the individual and personal equipment of the girl.

In regard to the family, we find:

1. "That the parental relationships are more complete among the High School group. As against six incomplete parental relationships in the delinquent group, here there are only two, and there are no cases of separation.
2. That in those families of the High School group in which parental relationships are not complete, either the mother is exceptionally capable of fulfilling both parental functions, or else there is another relative who is capable of contributing some of the care which might normally have been given by the missing parent.
3. That whereas bitterness and antagonism has marked the personal relationships of the parents during the childhood of the girl in four of the delinquent leaders, there is no case of this among the High School girls, and in the only case in which the parents are not completely congenial, they find their bond of unity in the child rather than making the child the butt of their antagonism.
4. That, in the High School group there has, with one exception, been agreement between the parents as to the discipline of the child (and in this case agreement was reached before any policy was used) whereas in the other group there

have been constant disputes between the father or stepfather and the mother, and, with the exception of one household, completely different methods have been used by each parent.

5. That the 'leader' in the High School group has been treated always with admiration and respect on the part of her parents. In the other households she appears to have met with criticism and suspicion or with lack of understanding on the part of one or both parents.
6. That both the mother-daughter and the father-daughter relationships in the High School group have been for the most part satisfactory —that is to say, there has been satisfaction on both sides in companionship. This can only be said to have been so in two of the families of the delinquent group, and in both those families the death of the father meant that the mother's time and energy was absorbed in earning for the household. The necessity of the mother becoming wage earner was only found in two of the High School group, and in both these cases she supplemented the wage of the father, and was not wholly depended upon.
7. That the matter of sex education was met by five of the mothers (or in one case by the relative taking the mother's place) in the High School group, whereas by none of the mothers in the case of the delinquents was it squarely faced. This is indicative of the degree of confidence as well as affection which existed between mother and daughter.
8. That the High School girls are absorbed and contented in their homes and family life and have for the most part such a variety of home

occupations and interests that they get little time for outside activities other than those in connection with the school. The delinquent girls are all rebels from home; running away, keeping late hours and ignoring attempts at discipline. They have few interests in the home, and they do not, either through force of circumstances or through their own choice, join with members of their family in their leisure time.

9. That the size of the family is larger in the High School group than it is in the delinquent group. The largest family is seven as compared with three. All the leaders have been given definite responsibility in the household, and, where there are younger brothers or sisters, have taken a large share in their upbringing, and have, on the whole, been admired and looked up to by them. In only one family among the delinquent has this responsibility been entrusted to the elder sister.
10. That, though the elder brothers and sisters have, on the whole, been 'lesser lights' in the eyes of their parents than the girls selected as 'leaders,' they have been children whose conduct is approved both by their parents and their schools. In the case of the delinquents we have seen that all the elder brothers and sisters were delinquent before the girls in question."

In regard to the school we find:

1. "That scholarship in the High School group is markedly superior to that in the delinquent group, where most of the girls are retarded owing to continued absence.

2. That family moves, involving changes in school have been far more frequent in the delinquent group than they have in the High School group, where four of the children went straight through elementary school and High School in the same neighborhood.
3. That on the whole there appears to have been a more personal understanding attitude present in the school, which helped in the early adjustment of the non-delinquent to her High School.
4. That whereas the High School leaders are totally absorbed in their school activities and traditions, the attitude of the delinquents towards High School has been one of apathy or rebellion. In only one case has there been any coöperative leadership on the part of the delinquent girl in school, and this came to an end in her elementary school."

In regard to the neighborhood, recreation and the church:

1. "There is conspicuously better integration in the neighborhood of the High School girls; that is to say, the neighborhood is older and more stable, and there is more agreement as to the things which are desirable in the community, and more consistency in their expression.
2. Those activities which go on in the neighborhood are, for the most part, associated for High School girls with the family, school or church. With the other group their activities are connected with commercialized recreation, are spasmodic and undirected. Little interest is taken in church except as a means to escape from home, whereas some of the High School

girls have become definitely attached to the church for purposes of service to the community."

Finally, with regard to individual and personal differences:

1. "The delinquent group are, as a whole, larger and heavier in physique and are less inclined to delicate health and are more outstanding in their restlessness and energy.
2. There is no parallel to their over-weight and probable tendency towards glandular disturbance in the High School group.
3. On the average the delinquent group are slightly inferior in intelligence (average 98.0 as compared with 103.0). There are two 'dull normals' in the delinquent group and none in the non-delinquent.
4. In fashions the delinquents are more exaggerated and extreme, and the other group, though they are careful followers of the fashion, do not, on the whole, dress so as to attract individual attention.
5. The delinquents are not so outstanding in the matter of special abilities, in which the High School group are remarkably skilled and versatile. This may be due to the fact that their latent capacities have not had an opportunity to develop.
6. The delinquents have not nearly such broad interests. They do far less reading, less handwork at home in the way of cooking and sewing, and less writing. They appear to depend more upon movies and dance halls. Fewer of

them have been given the opportunity to pursue hobbies at home.

7. In personality adjustment the delinquent group would again appear to be inferior. In the only two cases where there is a tendency towards maladjustment in the High school group some solution to the trouble has been found in religious faith—which is not found as a really vital personal factor in any of the delinquent group.
8. The delinquent girls appear to be more markedly aggressive, more self-confident and less suggestible than the other group.
9. They have a tendency towards lying and exaggeration and a lack of respect for property, of which there is no evidence among the High School girls.
10. In attention they are more inclined to distractability of an extreme kind.
11. There is more evidence of enjoyment of teasing and practical jokes among the delinquent group than among the High School group."

In conclusion stress might be laid justifiably upon the fact that it is the *situation* as well as the *personalities* in the two groups that differ so markedly. Attention has already been drawn to the importance of the fact that social conspicuousness in the case of the delinquents was always associated with rebellion from home and from school. There appears to be enough data in the comparative study to indicate that this rebellion was a combination of circumstances, and that the social settings were such that exceptional personality does not need to be assumed in order to account for the end result. Though we cannot presume to distinguish them from innate

tendencies, environmental influences seem to have played a tremendous part in forcing these girls out of their usual group attachments and therefore in making them conspicuous, talked of and blamed.

Their outstanding physique and energy, together with a tendency towards poor endocrine balance, might well exaggerate those drives which determine behavior and make them lacking in proportion and control. The fact that these girls appear to be exceptionally "gregarious"—to love and to be dependent upon the companionship of their fellows and to be exceptionally capable of handling them or directing their responses, is a matter dependent upon their personal relationships with their fellows." [4]

Some practical suggestions to parents.

The individual parent can no longer wholly protect his child from what we call "bad company." Protection in our modern world cannot be gained by sheltering, or isolation. The parent can no more shut his child off from contact with behavior codes, ideas, personalities that are "unwholesome" than he can keep him from breathing tainted air. As long as these sources of infection exist they will enter. Whether or not they do damage will depend in matters of mental health, as in the case of physical health, on the degree of sturdy immunity which may have been set up.

When a child responds to vulgarity, obscenity, cheap adventure and excitement, it is because of some unfed curiosity, some feeling of insecurity and unhappiness, some thirst for life and knowledge. One need only turn to those fortunate children of

[4] Brown, S. B., loc. cit. The above are the outstanding conclusions reached by Miss Brown.

some modern parents whose worldly wisdom outruns anything the little drab leaders of the streets can offer, and whose vitality is superior to the tawdry enticement of commercialized "recreation." These families contain influences that from the beginning make for a gradual emancipation of the young, not only from the home, but from any possible slavery to "bad company."

Take sex information, and misinformation,—that endless theme of conversation in gangs and between "undesirable" friends. It has no allurement for the child whose desire for knowledge has not been thwarted by ignorant or ashamed adults. It flourishes among children whose curiosity has never been satisfied and who are consequently over-stimulated by the least mention of sex.

"I think mamma was rather exceptional about that," says Madeline. "She told us everything we wanted to know. She thinks it's better that way. You see she wasn't told herself and learnt everything outside the family and it made it awfully difficult. I was six years old when my little sister was born and I knew all about it then. I knew everything at about ten or eleven. It never frightened me. I thought it was quite natural and interesting. We were taught about things generally at school, plant life and animal life and this all seemed to lead up to it. Mamma had four very good little books she left around for us to read."

Contrast this with the statement of a court girl who was told when she was about twelve by a friend of her sister's whom she hated: "Gee! I was scared. I thought it was terrible."

Leadership is always mysterious. We do not know the forces of physical and mental energy that

lie back of the personality that becomes a dynamic center.

Some of the world's best work has been accomplished by individuals whose energy appears to be running a race between genius and dissipation. Certain "organic tensions" seem necessary to those who do "big things," as Kempf and others have suggested. That these tensions are maintained is important. In pathological cases there may be recourse to the over-use of "stimulants," such as coffee or tobacco, or a turning to alcohol or drugs. While the physiological make-up of the individual may account for a portion of these disasters, we must always ask, has the family of the gifted individual, or the community itself erected so many barriers to creative work that the energy of the exceptional individual spills out of its channel and runs to waste?

The delinquent girl "leader" has tremendous vitality. As we observe her she seems never to tire, and she reports herself as being always "full of pep," restless, "on the go." Her schedule is full of what we call from our point of view useless activity. Her recreation does not leave her with a feeling of satisfaction. Like the dancer, each contact with the ground seems to serve as a stimulus to send her further; unlike the dancer there is no rhythmic pattern for her movement.

The pattern is furnished by the life of the community in which the child lives. Parents must concern themselves with this.

Summarizing the results of these studies in leadership, we note that the family like the Juvenile Court must deal, not with individuals in isolation, but in relation to those forces in personality which attract, or antagonize. The home has new responsibilities,

chief of which in our modern age is a clearer vision of the purposes of community life. Undoubtedly there are forces in human beings which tend to dominate, or to liberate, to destroy, or to create.

Parents must take a new attitude toward friends. The relationship between personalities is a matter of greatest importance. Whether they become "constructive" or "destructive" will depend in large measure upon the treatment given the individual child in the family. If parents, through antagonism to each other, force loyalty to become fixed to an unworthy individual, or to a small group engaged in warfare, such as some *gangs,* they have only themselves to blame for the harmful result.

As Forel observed, the "greatest enemies of ants are other ants, just as the greatest enemies of men are other men," so we see in the lives of the most anti-social individuals a warped kind of socialization. They respond to leadership, all the more damaging because it is in conflict with accepted goals.

Those leaders whom we call constructive have been given something in their family group which makes for the growth of responsibility. We may stress many obvious things; regularity of living, consistency of purpose in family life, cultivation of socially useful habits, recognition of skill and achievement in the individual child, use of social resources, the building up of the feeling of confidence in the trustworthiness of adults. But these are end-results. The essential core is found in the attitude of the parent toward personality. If the parent is possessive in his relationship to his child, if he merely projects his own ambition, the child will turn elsewhere. If the parent is genuinely solicitous for the well-being of the child, he will be incapable

of thwarting his growth attempts. Nor will he ridicule his children's friends.

It is a curious fact that adolescent children who are antagonistic to their parents appear to seek the *missing* parent among their adult friends, or their contemporaries. The personality of the undesirable friend is so often an image of the dream-parent, a kind of substitute for what the child desired of his parent!

From delinquent "leaders" has been withheld, not only normal parental relationships but adequate understanding on the part of the community. Rejected by the school, the church, and the club, isolated and distorted by neighborhood gossip, they find their only road to prestige to be in rebellion. Equipped with energy, both physical and mental, possessed of surprising buoyancy and courage, these young people explore every avenue and find it blocked. The wise parent is the one who opens doors, and who realizes that while ultimately "loyalty" may be "the devotion of the self to the community," the chief door to it, in adolescence, is the attraction of personality.

"What is sound in the collective life is that which completes the personal and carries it on to a higher harmony of wider sweep. What is unsound is that which, pretending superiority to the pettiness of personal life, is in reality moved by the pettier personal motives, such as those of ambition, egotism, love of domination and the rest, and by infusing these toxins into the spirit of community corrupts the best influences that might regenerate human life." [5]

Nothing is more important than a community social prophylaxis that will render these toxins harmless.

[5] Hobhouse, L. T.: "Elements of Social Justice," p. 30.

CHAPTER IX

PARENTS IN SEARCH OF EDUCATION

For the first time in history parents are deliberately seeking education in the craft of parenthood. Thousands have enrolled themselves in classes, chosen leaders and gone to work in earnest. Thoughtless people, on seeing parents rush in such numbers to the recent conferences on parenthood,[1] might conclude the "movement" was a fad, or that never were parents so baffled and perplexed as these. Those who are familiar with parent education classes recognize their sincerity. This movement is unlike many "educational" ones among adults; it is not animated by desire to make more money, win distinction, or add to charm; it is a conscious attempt on the part of parents to fit themselves to bear responsibility. There are tremendous social implications involved.

All sorts of questions arise. Is it possible to educate parents? If it is possible, are they worthy of education? What purpose can be served by educating them? Who, or what, is back of this demand? Who stirred parents up to want to be educated? Is there any material on hand? Who are qualified to become teachers? What should a program in parental education include? What is the learning process? How can the results be evaluated?

[1] New York, 1925; Chicago, Los Angeles, and Baltimore, 1926.

Can parents be educated?

Numerous educators, scientists and philosophers have held that society could evolve a better plan for children than to leave them to the haphazard care of parents. As our case-descriptions in clinics and courts pile up, the wealth of evidence that the "normal" home, as well as the broken home, fosters malnutrition, physical and spiritual, that sordid habit-settings and moral maladjustments occur in the "best" families, the conclusion grows, not that parents need education, but that a specialized agency had better take over the whole matter of child rearing.

The poignantly dismal picture of "The Way of All Flesh" drawn by Samuel Butler [2] is not merely a case against parental cruelty. It is an indictment against all parents, unequaled in any literature. A great protest was raised. In rebuttal:

"He ridiculed the Bishop of Carlisle for saying that we long to meet our parents in the next world. 'Speaking for myself, I have no wish to see my father again, and I think it likely that the Bishop of Carlisle would not be more eager to see his than I mine. "Melchisedec" was a really happy man. He was without father, without mother, and without descent. He was an incarnate bachelor. He was a born orphan.'" [3]

As the title indicates, Butler did not think his experience an isolated one. The mere fact of parenthood leads to a possessive and dominant attitude, unfitting human beings to have charge of others.

[2] Begun in the year 1872, finished 1884, and published posthumously. For an excellent edition see E. P. Dutton, New York, 1916.

[3] Cited by William Lyon Phelps in his introduction to "The Way of All Flesh," p. VII.

Hugh Walpole in "Fortitude," Galsworthy in "The Forsyte Saga," preach the same gospel.

Plato was of the opinion that before anything could be done toward building an ideal state all persons over ten years of age (except of course, the philosophers) should be sent out of the country, so that the young should not be corrupted by the habits of their elders.[4]

Some one has said recently: "It is not gin, jazz or modern pleasure that destroys young people, but parents. They do the most harm. They thwart and hamper their children—for what cause? For their whims, based on nothing, not even tradition."

Psychiatrists and social workers frequently find parents on the liability side on their patient's chances for recovery. When every known process of education is invoked in behalf of certain parents they are either resentful, or appear totally unable to change their methods of treatment.

To put the matter concretely, a psychiatric social worker writes for advice in the following letter:

> "Our clinic and other social agencies are frequently confronted with cases where it seems most desirable to remove a child from the home, but where we have no recourse. Efforts to change the attitudes of the parents or their method of dealing with the child have failed and their coöperation in placing the child outside the home cannot be gained. The court appears to have no jurisdiction, because neglect, in the physical sense, abuse, dependency or immorality, which would make the parents unfit guardians, are not factors in these cases. The influence of the parent is a

[4] Quoted by Durant, Will, Ph.D.: "The Story of Philosophy."

more subtle thing, created by disharmony between the parents and centering, perhaps, about the child in question, serving to stimulate or create unfortunate behavior on the part of the child. In some of these cases the behavior is of such a nature that the child may be taken into court on a charge of delinquency or incorrigibility. In other instances the behavior is not anti-social, but, if continued, it presages grave danger to the mental and social development of the child. Frequently these children may be regarded as pre-delinquents.

"Perhaps a brief outline of one case will make clearer the type of situation we have in mind: Emma, an eight-year-old, the third of seven children of American parents, sucks her thumb and strokes her ear for hours at a stretch, shows no pleasure or enjoyment in any of the ordinary activities of children of her age, is seclusive even at home where her brothers and sisters romp and play about her, but has outbrusts of temper when frustrated. She is stoical in the face of physical punishment and is considered by her father, an ignorant, gruff man, to be 'hard as nails.' He said in her presence: 'If she had been born at the hospital I would have thought the nurse mixed her with another child because she's like none of my other children.' The mother is irritated by the very sight of Emma indulging in thumbsucking and derides her for this 'nasty habit.' Emma was regarded as subnormal but intelligence tests showed her to have average intelligence.

"Emma has built up a protective shell of indifference and showed no emotional reaction to a discussion of her home situation. Subsequent to our examination of her she spent six weeks in a

hospital for an ocular operation. At the hospital and for a few weeks at home following the operation Emma showed some spontaneity and pleasure in playing with other children. Moreover, there was less thumbsucking at home. (Thumbsucking has never been observed at school and was not apparent at the hospital.) The parents said: 'She's a different girl.' The improvement did not last and the family have resumed their former attitude. Examination by the psychiatrist a few weeks later showed her to be even more repressed. He said: 'Emotionally, she is being killed.'

"We recently witnessed a demonstration of the treatment Emma receives. She started to resist the doctor who approached her with an eye dropper. Her mother lunged at her, held her arms down, her head back and thumped her intermittently on the shoulders, saying: 'Shut up, I'll tell your father, do you want a licking, stop, be good,' etc., etc. For several months a psychiatric social worker has labored to get the parents to adopt a different attitude toward the child and her habit of thumbsucking and has pointed out the harm of the repressive discipline. The results have been as negative as earlier attempts of the family doctor to dissuade the parents from using physical punishment on the score that the child's nerves were being harmed, and the advice of relatives to the parents to 'lay off Emma and pick on some of the other kids.' The parents are defensive now and in contradiction to the father's former statement that Emma never cried no matter how hard he whipped her, they claim that they never lay a hand on her. From the clinic's point of view, it is not the whipping alone which proves them incapable

of helping this child to make a normal adjustment to life. In fact, when all of the facts in the case are taken into consideration, it seems not unlikely that, in a few years, remedial measures will be of no avail and this child will be a burden on the state as a delinquent or as a patient in a state hospital."

Thus the presumption that parents are the natural guardians and protectors of their children is challenged by philosophers, novelists and scientists.

The average person, however, still believes in parents. The modern social worker places children among foster-parents when they have come to grief through the blunders of their natural parents, supposing that *parental* care is the ideal.[5]

Even when it is obvious that a child is better off in an institution, the kindly Rotarian is of the opinion that a model institution should be as "home-like" as possible. The caretakers are to be called "house-fathers" and "house-mothers," and the whole plant should duplicate, as nearly as possible, the scene of family life.

Similarly, the Juvenile Court law instructs its interpreters:

"This act should be liberally construed to the end that its purpose may be carried out, to wit—that the care, custody and discipline of the ward of the Juvenile Court shall be, as nearly as may be, that which should have been given by the parents."

Are the woeful results we see in "homes," cor-

[5] In the main, so far as research goes, the principle of foster-home care works out well. Theis, Sophie Van Senden: How Foster Children Turn Out, State Charities Aid Assn., 105 E. 22nd St., N. Y., 1924, Publication No. 165.

rectional schools and juvenile reformatories, the current use of flogging, ice-packs, cold "baths," starvation, solitary confinement, sneering, spying, isolation behind high fences, head-shaving, tying up, the use of the "third degree,"—are these modes of punishment sincerely believed to be the natural accompaniments of *parental* discipline? Are these refinements of torture, so widespread in our country in the treatment of juveniles, learned from parents, or did their perpetrators invent them spontaneously?

Let us assume that the blunders of parents and the sins committed by public officials in the name of parents are not inherent in parenthood, but are the inevitable results of ignorance, and that parents share with all flesh the capacity for education.

Shall we educate parents?

In a democracy, the answer to this question must be the affirmative. In the past, parents were cut off from education because they belonged to a group having supreme rights and powers. All despotisms have given legal rulers the right to deal with defenseless persons in any way they saw fit. To raise the question of education would be sacrilege, suggesting some flaw in procedure or in exercise of authority. When the husband was given jurisdiction over the lives of his wives and children, as "many highly civilized states have done in the past," [6] it was fruitless to talk of education. When any group in the community is given or assumes arbitrary power, either by law, or tradition, it is automatically cut off from education.

[6] Root, William T. Jr., Ph.D.: "A Series of Six Talks on Criminology," Radio Publications No. 17, University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1925, p. 7

We may compare the difference between the professions of medicine and law in this respect. Doctors may disagree with a given diagnosis, and go unpunished. To question a court decision is a misdemeanor, punishable by "contempt" proceedings. If the critic be a lawyer, and persistent, he may be disbarred from his profession.

When parents seek education voluntarily the social implication is that they have lost omnipotence. They have fallen out of the class of rulers. The concept of training and preparation for parenthood may open the door for the entry of knowledge into other domains, for example, the police, the courts and municipal councils.

Not only has parental omnipotence vanished legally, but science has pointed out the insufficiency of instinct. The only attribute parents bring to their task is affection, and this is not enough to solve their problems. Since mere exposure to parenthood does not qualify, we must seek knowledge and discipline. Our problem is to secure the habits of mind that place the parent in the attitude of the learner. Can parents do this without destroying their initiative and spontaneous joy? Education has its dangers. By dragging into consciousness those processes by which the race has reared their young, can we avoid loss of that vitality which is inherent in unreflective actions? Doubtless this is an academic question. Parents can and do fit themselves by education to become better parents.

In any case the modern parent is protected against the termination of his education. His children see to that. In the long run the best educators of parents are the children themselves.

What is parental education?

Parental education seeks to make available to parents the findings and recommendations of science, education and social work as to the care of children in their own homes. It deals with the child's development as an organism, with health factors, physical disturbances, and hygiene. It traces the growth of the child from infancy, through adolescence. It deals with the mental life of the child, its capacity for learning, its habit formation, education of the emotions, with imagination, memory, curiosity, attention, imitation, and suggestion, language and speech development, freedom and discipline, obedience, initiative, ambitions and ideals, rivalry and competition, love-life, and sociability.[7]

Recently its emphasis has been on human relationships, the changing attitudes toward parents and children, the subtle matter of response.

In brief, there are two aims, the acquisition of information as to the physical, mental, emotional and social development of children and parents, and the growth of skill on the part of the family in putting knowledge into practice. It is as far removed as possible from an academic course *about* parents and children. The scientist in his laboratory knows far more than parents do, but mere knowledge would not make him a better parent. Parental education shares with art and religion their practical discipline, and their goal of creative achievement. Unlike science, it is an interested party in the outcome. It seeks to nourish and preserve family life.

It is important to recognize the difference in aim

[7] *See* Gruenberg, Benjamin, Ph.D.: "Outlines of Child Study, a Manual for Parents and Teachers," New York. Macmillan Company, 1924.

between scientific research and parental education. We may compare the parent to the forest ranger. The forest ranger's concern is with the preservation of trees, water, wild flowers, and animals and birds. In this he is assisted by all those who passionately love the out-of-doors. He must know enough about "nature study" to aid him in avoiding destruction, he must have a strong arm against vandals, but it is not essential that he be a man of science. All the classification of birds in the world will not save a single bird. Only bird-lovers can do that. Knowledge of their secrets adds to our delight and makes us better able to educate, or to restrain their destroyers. So with parents; they submit to courses in the anatomy of their children's bodies and minds in order that they understand how to serve them better.

The beginnings of organized education for parenthood.

As with all important streams, the sources of parent education are numerous. In Europe, Pestalozzi and others tried to bring parents together for mutual discussion of their problems. In America we may trace the beginnings to mothers:

> "Thirty years ago a woman, a mother, a student of childhood, conceived the idea of parenthood as a profession in which the united efforts of individuals would make for progress as surely as they do in medicine or the law.
>
> "The Congress of Mothers, which Alice McLellan Birney had founded in 1897, adopted parent-teacher coöperation as part of its program. This line of development became at once so popular that for some years it almost overshadowed the original purpose of the organization—the training

of parents in the care and understanding of little children." [8]

Mrs. Bird Stein Gans, President of the Child Study Association of America, writes as follows:

"The Parental Education Movement in this country owes its origin to a suggestion made by Professor Felix Adler about forty years ago. His fundamental thesis—which continues to be the keynote of the movement to-day, that parenthood is a vocation requiring knowledge, applied intelligence and the wisdom that results from the combination—inspired him to suggest the formation of a small group of women for discussion of the problem of childhood and child rearing.

"That group of five women which was known as 'The Society for the Study of Child Nature' included Mrs. Felix Adler and was led by Mrs. Harry Hastings, well known in those days as a pioneer in the various fields of women's activities, and was later composed of about twenty members.

"The reception accorded their activities by the public with whom they came in contact was far from flattering. For to the public of that day, the thought that the maternal instinct could or should be supplemented by the results of scientific research or that traditional educational methods such as were embodied in the maxim about sparing the rod and spoiling the child might be subject to challenge, seemed absurdly presumptuous, if not unholy.

"The writer, then a young mother with two

[8] Reeve, Margaretta Willis and Lombard, Ellen C. The Parent-Teacher Associations. Bulletin No. 11, 1924-1926-1927. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

babies and acutely aware of her problems, and even more acutely aware of her limitations, stumbled upon its activities a few years before it disbanded. By that time, the group, composed of women somewhat older than she, with older children, had passed from the problems of infancy and early childhood to those of adolescence, and therefore they failed to meet her own pressing needs and those of the younger mothers situated as she was.

"So with the help and advice of the leader of the older group, she undertook to organize a group of younger mothers, and since there was no other leadership available, to lead the new group herself.

"Thus Chapter I of 'The Society for the Study of Child Nature' came into being about thirty years ago. It consisted of a group of twenty-five mothers, all like the writer, untrained, but all conscious that there was much that was wrong or inadequate in the old methods and all certain that by reading, studying, discussion and interchange of experience they could evolve something better for their own children.

"Their task was, in large measure, that of the pioneer. Literature was meager. Such as there was, in the main, was technical and theoretic, suited rather for development through academic methods than for the practical guidance of a lay group with pressing personal problems to be elucidated.

"The approach was new—method and technique had to be defined and evolved. Leadership consisted first in keeping a jump or two ahead of the rest of the group, by dint of digging and reading

in Teachers College Library in the search for material that might prove helpful, and second, in confining discussion within the bounds of relevancy and maintaining order in the records and proceedings.

"Rousseau's 'Emile,' Locke's 'Essay on Understanding,' and similar classics perforce furnished the text and basis for discussion in the early days. And the members met faithfully once a week for a two-hour discussion of papers based upon the text, and of personal problems relevant to the principles evolved from them, or presented by the paper.

"The original society having disbanded, it was left to Chapter I and the chapters formed through the impulse given by it, and organized by its leader, to carry on and develop the work.

"The demand grew slowly but steadily. Chapter II was formed five years later, Chapter III and IV following soon after, all still under the same leadership with slowly developing assistants; in each case as a result of the enthusiasm for the work and the results evinced by members of the preceding chapters.

"Until 1907 the movement was confined to New York. In that year a sister of one of the members of Chapter I, who had moved to Baltimore, organized there the first out-of-town chapter, from which has grown the present 'Baltimore District' of the Child Study Association with its nine groups.

"As the organization expanded, its scope increased. The lack of intelligently selected lists of readings for children or of educational literature

for parents prompted the compilation of such lists, and several of the chapters undertook the work of compilation and classification.

"This and similar activities led to overlapping and duplication of work, and to avoid these results, to furnish a depository for the records of accumulating experience, and in order to pool resources so as to supplement the ordinary work with occasional lectures from educational experts or experts in allied fields, it was resolved to federate the existing chapters, and the 'Federation for Child Study' came into being. This was in 1912. Since then the work has progressed and expanded and there are now sixty-two chapters in and about New York and similar groups organized either as chapters of the Child Study Association (incorporated in 1924 to take over the work of the Federation and to provide for publication the results of its experience) or as Affiliated Groups in other parts of the United States in the number of fifty-three; and there are chapters or Affiliated Groups in Japan, Great Britain, and China.

"While the movement has thus progressed and its activities have expanded so as to include training courses for leaders in Parental Education, the publication of pamphlets, manual readings, various book lists, and a monthly periodical, also the supervision of 'Play Schools' and Health Centers, in one aspect it has clung tenaciously to a concept which its members have regarded as the essence of its activities and as the definition of their scope. It is an organization of laymen, primarily to educate laymen, and its method is self-educational—

its aim is to have the groups led by trained laymen in order to develop in the groups a thinking and responsible membership—and throughout these thirty years it has developed under the same leadership. Its purpose is to respond to the practical needs of the parents or those standing in the shoes of parents who have to deal with the daily problem of child development. It serves the cause of scientific research, by translating theory into terms comprehensible to the lay mind, bringing it into practice, and affording opportunity for the test and evaluation that practice alone affords. But fundamentally it is a response to the ever-growing demand for better parenthood emanating from those who desire to find the way to become better parents." [9]

The parental education movement.

The Parent-Teacher Associations have grown also. "In 1920 there were in this country fewer than 200,000 members, in some thirty-eight state branches of what is now called the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. In 1926 more than a million men and women are active members, in forty-seven states, the District of Columbia and the Territory of Hawaii.[10]

Other organizations have entered the field, among which we may list the American Association of University Women (Lois Hayden Week, Ph.D., Director, Washington, D. C.); the Monmouth County Organization of Social Service (New Jersey); the Child Study Association of America

[9] Letter from Mrs. Bird Stein Gans to the writer, August, 1927.

[10] Reeve and Lombard.

(New York); the Women's Coöperative Alliance (Minneapolis, Minnesota); the Child Training Committee of Children's Conference (Cleveland); the Parents' Council (Philadelphia).

Innumerable groups of parents unaffiliated with any agencies have formed study groups all over the country. There has been remarkable unanimity of procedure in spite of different origins. The movement has been free of fads and mutual warfare. It uses no special jargon.

There has been vigorous discussion over the problem of leadership. Shall the leaders or teachers be academically trained or shall they be lay-persons, whose knowledge has been tempered by experience in parenthood? Fortunately in most groups one does not have to make the choice. Despite the rulings of some boards of education, some teachers are parents. The outstanding leaders of parent-education in this country are mothers, fathers, or grandparents.

Classifying parental education activities we find them grouped as follows: rural organizations, city organizations, Nursery Schools, departments in state universities, private organizations, special classes conducted by Juvenile Courts, religious organizations, health agencies, organizations supplying guidance and correspondence material, and centers of child welfare research.[11]

Rural organizations, connected with extension departments of state colleges, or other centers working with rural people, are conducting classes in parental education in Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota,

[11] Study by Ruth Haefner, Iowa State University, Iowa City, Iowa, 1926.

New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Utah and Virginia.

There are classes conducted by city school administrations, departments of vocational education and other public and private associations in California, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia and Colorado.

The Juvenile Courts of Chicago, Denver, Detroit, and Los Angeles conduct classes for parents. Detroit has a special class for foster-parents, and for mothers receiving widows' pensions. Los Angeles conducts a research department in family relationships, working on such problems as antagonism, adolescent leadership, child custody cases, and sexual promiscuity among young girls.

The results of these studies are presented to two groups of parents, those of "advantaged" families, and those of the Juvenile Court. In addition, material on current social problems is furnished to high schools for class-discussion.

The church has entered the field of parental education. The Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. have a joint-commission on the Problems in Family Life of To-day. The Methodist churches in Evanston, Illinois, and in Nashville, Tennessee, conduct regular classes under trained leaders. The Church of the Latter Day Saints in Salt Lake City, Utah, has two large classes.

The following universities have centers of child welfare research with Nursery Schools and programs of parental education: Yale; Iowa; Minnesota; Teachers College, New York City; New York State College of Home Economics, Ithaca; McGill University, Montreal; The University of Toronto;

Vassar;[12] and the University of California, Berkeley.

The Nursery School idea.

An important phase of the movement is that which relates to Nursery Schools. Among the cities which have well-established Nursery Schools are Chicago, Iowa City, Boston, Detroit, Minneapolis, New York, Ithaca, Poughkeepsie, Cincinnati, Montreal, Toronto, Berkeley, California and Los Angeles.

The Nursery School of the Merrill-Palmer Foundation, Detroit, Michigan, under the inspired leadership of Helen Thompson Woolley,[13] is the most famous in this country.

Nothing could be more unlike the Nursery School than the old day nursery, which was founded as a philanthropic adjunct to our economic system, a convenient parking space for children of working mothers. The day nursery was provided for the poor, the Nursery School serves all classes, and has been declared by Bertrand Russell an indispensable device for the education of all children.

The Nursery School idea has been delightfully described by Dr. Elizabeth L. Woods.[14]

Conceived primarily as a laboratory for the train-

[12] Andrus, Ruth, Ph.D.: "Family Relationships and Organization of the Home." (A description of the summer program of the Euthenics Institute, Vassar College.) Published in *Journal of the American Association of University Women,* Vol. XX, No. 3, April 1927, p. 85.

[13] Woolley, Helen Thompson, Ph.D.: "An Experimental Study of Children." Macmillan. New York, 1926, 762 pp.

[14] Woods, Elizabeth L., Ph.D. Director, Department of Psychology and Educational Research, Los Angeles City Schools: "The Nursery School Idea; Modern Parenthood; Proceedings of the Southern California Conference, Los Angeles," December, 1926, pp. 70-82. Address: Southern California Society for Mental Hygiene, 632 Consolidated Bldg., Los Angeles, California.

ing of parents, and young college students in the care of children, its program embraces a thorough study of the child by pediatricians, psychologists, educators, nutrition experts and psychiatrists. Careful records are kept of the child's progress. The parents meet regularly for observation of child-life and for training, both theoretical and practical. All this is the mere bony structure. It does not hamper the child, who, living under conditions that approximate the ideal for scientific purposes, knows only that he has an interesting program and is surrounded by lovable adults who control their tempers.

The Nursery School's approach to the child "is an endeavor to put into actual practice the thing that is being taught us from every platform . . . that the child must be considered as a whole being, physical, intellectual, emotional; the leaders must have not only knowledge of child psychology, but inhibitions so perfect in function as to prohibit them from anticipating trouble, raising issues, arguing, demanding, showing anxiety or otherwise making dramatic and interesting the conduct which they wish to erase from the child's behavior patterns." [15]

Many educators are now of the opinion that the Nursery School will go a long way toward "solving our problem of trying to integrate personalities, trying to forestall some of the maladjustments which are rife among our school children."

But its greatest importance is in the education of parents. The opportunity to observe such difficulties as food-refusals, sleeplessness, fear of the doctor, shyness, negativism, quarrelsomeness, crying, overcome successfully without force; to see "spoiled," fretful, unhappy children grow in poise

[15] Dr. E. L. Woods, 73-75.

and serenity is a great boon to parents in this day of one- and two-child families. To observe the behavior of other people's children is the shortest road to objective knowledge of child psychology. Our pride, shame, anxiety and self-love often prevent us from learning from our own children.

The anthropologist may question whether the Nursery School, in its grouping of young children together, providing them with the association of their contemporaries, is a permanent need, but, if it reawakens the interest of parents in child-life generally, we may conclude it is of inestimable value in modern life.

Humanizing science for the benefit of parents.

In America we owe to G. Stanley Hall the wealth of material on child study we now possess. It was he who dug it out of the mine of laboratories and scientific monographs, and infused it with life and color. His enthusiasm, boundless flair for the dramatic, his immense sympathy for youth, inspired hundreds of humdrum students. (It was a favorite saying of his that the Greeks called their teachers *inspirers* because they believed enthusiasm to be the only vitalizer of the mind.) Professional scientists criticized him. He certainly destroyed the orderly tethering of facts in rows, so dear to their camp, but parents should be grateful, for he was the first in this country to make parenthood seem a great adventure. Nothing interested him more than *Mother-Craft;* the activities of the organization bearing this name owe their inspiration to him.

If G. Stanley Hall was a pioneer in humanizing science for the benefit of parents, the idea is not new.

In 1847 Froebel established a training school for

children's nurses and educators. In this he was following his teacher, Pestalozzi, who declared the education of mothers the highest goal of education.

Gesell quotes Herbert Spencer: "If by some strange chance not a vestige of us descended to the remote future save a pile of our school books or some college examination papers, we may imagine how puzzled an antiquary of the period would be on finding in them no indication that the learners were ever likely to be parents . . . Seriously, is it not an astonishing fact that, though in the treatment of offspring depend their lives and deaths, and their moral welfare or ruin, yet not one word of instruction on the treatment of offspring is ever given to those who will hereafter be parents?" [16]

Helen Thompson Woolley writes: "There has been a good deal of discussion about who is to blame for the fact that so many children are badly brought up. The consensus seems to be that it is the parents . . . The queer thing is that we seem to think we have gone a long way toward a solution when we state that parents are to blame. . . . But who are the parents? They are grown-up children. Are we going to make them better parents by just telling them they are bad parents? . . . The problem is one of providing a new type of education. . . . Nowhere in our present system is education for parenthood adequately provided for." [17]

The difficulty in the way has been dearth of material. This is now available. James Harvey Rob-

[16] Gesell, Arnold: "The Pre-School Child." Houghton, Mifflin.

[17] Woolley, Helen Thompson, Ph.D.: Address before the National Conference on Modern Parenthood, New York City, October, 1925. Republic Publishing Company.

inson, in pointing out the need for humanizing all scientific knowledge, may have outraged the pure scientists, but he was in harmony with the most vital element in modern psychology. Galton, Binet, Dewey, Terman and Watson had already anticipated this plea.[18]

Public school courses in child care.

The schools are beginning to give systematic courses to young girls and boys in human relationships, particularly the vital, universal one of parent and child. Whether these young people become parents is not so important as the awakening of community intelligence about childhood. Almost all women who enter professional life are concerned with children and youth.[19]

A survey made by the Merrill-Palmer School shows that 79 per cent of the states in the union have units of child-care work included in the courses of study for public school children. Seven states have state-wide programs. Only four states are not interested. In twenty states the work is given through Vocational Home Economics; in twelve, in General Home Economics; in five, in Health and Hygiene; in four, in Home Nursing; in four in Infancy and Maternity Hygiene; in Red Cross classes, in two; in civics, one. The total number of schools having

[18] For a short account of the contributions of modern science in democratizing knowledge see Paynter, Richard H., Jr., Ph.D.: "Humanizing Psychology in the Study of Behavior Problems in Children"; School and Society, Vol. XXIV, No. 619, November 6, 1926.

[19] The United States Census Report of 1920 shows that 72 per cent of individuals engaged in professional life deal with children—52 per cent of the total number of men, and 94 per cent of the total number of women in professional groups.

these courses is reported by State Departments of Education as 967.[20]

So far this instruction has been given most frequently in the high schools. In three states it is introduced in the seventh grade; in 32 per cent of the places it is given in the ninth grade; in 31 per cent in the twelfth grade, and in 29 per cent in the eleventh grade.

That this is not sufficient, if the instruction is to bear results in the everyday life of American homes, is shown by the fact that the large majority of children leaving school do so in the fifth and sixth grades, at the age of fourteen years. "Seventy-four per cent of children receiving work permits have not gone beyond the fifth grade."

In 1925 there were three thousand marriages of couples under fifteen years of age:

> "Interesting statistics from a few states regarding age of marriage show that:
>
> 13,000 girls 15 years of age are legally married.
> 50,000 girls 16 years of age are legally married.
> 1,600 boys 15 years of age are legally married.
> 3,000 boys 16 years of age are legally married.
>
> "A study made by the Russell Sage Foundation shows that there are now about 700,000 persons in this country who were married while under sixteen years of age.
>
> "The girl who stops school at the seventh or eighth grade will have three or four children; the girl who finishes high school will have two, while college graduates average from .35 of a child at

[20] Crabbs, Lelah Mae and Miller, Mabel Lawrence: "A Survey of Public School Courses in Child Care for Girls." Merrill-Palmer School, Detroit, Michigan, May, 1927, 96 pp.

Bryn Mawr to .95 of a child at Mount Holyoke." [21]

As might be expected, the material offered in the public schools deals with the easiest, most objective aspects of child care, feeding, sleeping, bathing, clothing of infants, health-habits, and physical diseases. Proper qualifications for parenthood, individual responsibilities of family members, obligations of the family to the community and neighbors, emotional and social development, are mentioned in some courses, but yield in point of frequency to prenatal care, and physical care of the infant.

However, this is a worthy beginning and we should not minimize its importance.

Programs of education for parents.

The following program has been suggested: [22]

"1. Research.
   a. The family relationship.
   b. From the viewpoint of the parent.
      1. Child training in the home.
      2. Child training correlated with home management.
      3. Service of Nursery School.
   c. Growth and development of children.
   d. Status of group or community in which classes are organized. (Learn more about the people who are enrolled in parent classes.)
   e. Accurate records or minutes of meetings of groups. (Records of questions asked by parents.)

[21] Statistics cited by Crabbs and Miller, loc. cit., p. 25.
[22] Ruth Haefner: Iowa Child Welfare Research Station. University of Iowa. Bird T. Baldwin, Ph.D., director.

2. Teaching Material.
   a. Outlines—consecutive for several years.
   b. Illustrated material.
   c. Revision of present scientific textbooks for simple presentation for the average parent.
   d. Present research material made available for parent classes.
3. Training of Leaders.
   a. Methods of teaching.
      1. Experience necessary in some type of extension or social work, where actual contact with parents is obtained.
   b. Personality, qualifications and personal background.
4. Service of Specialists in Behavior Problems to Leaders of Parent Classes.
5. Need for Correlation of Program Throughout the United States.
   a. National Council for Parent Education.
      1. Clearing House.
   b. Conferences for leaders of groups.
      1. Subject matter or content.
      2. Teaching methods.
      3. Standards.
   c. Correlation of program in State.
      1. Department of Vocational Education.
      2. Extension Division—College, University.
      3. Maternity and Infant Welfare.
      4. Churches.
      5. Parent-Teacher Associations.
      6. Federation of Women's Clubs.

7. American Association of University Women.
8. Social Agencies.
9. American Legion.
10. National League of Women Voters."

The essential element in all parental education is to arouse the interests of parents to their immediate problems, their own weak points as parents, and to induce an attitude on the part of the parent to become the patient learner. To do this requires that the parent gain respect for the personality of the child. He must consider him worthy of observation, a human being, rather than an object for training.

Two approaches serve to bring this about; first the use of accurate observation, and recording; second, the undertaking of projects by parents. We may begin with simple things like sleep, diet, time-budgets, and pass to more difficult ones, such as the control of fears, nagging, impatience, parental interference, and habit-formation of children.

Projects, *i.e.*, the deliberate choice by a parent of some problem in family life, or child management, and the working it out, day by day, recording trials and errors, failure and success and their attending circumstances, do more than anything else to tranquillize parents. It is only when we attack our problems whole, without analysis or imagination, that we are headed for failure.

Evaluating the results of parental education.

If attendance in child study groups is any sign, the movement for parental education is successful. Rarely do any of the thousands of classes in existence show a diminished attendance. On the contrary, they grow faster than leaders can be provided.

Accurate measurement of results here is more difficult than in other fields of education. It is clear that we can train parents in matters of diet and regimen. Can we expect them to become kind, wise, trustworthy, and imbued with a sense of fair-dealing?

That progress has been made in the actual solution of home problems is evident. Quoting the results of one class, typical of many hundreds, we find that "over 90 per cent reported that the practice in objective analysis of the behavior problems of their children had lessened both the frequency and the intensity of their impatience with their children's behavior." [23]

Their problems were as follows:

Problem in September	Status in December			
	The Same	*Worse*	*Improved*	*Solved*
Dawdles over dressing	12	2	15	
Dawdles over eating	2			
Argues when told to do something	5	1	13	2
Careless about putting things away	14		13	
Eating too rapidly	5		6	
Fingers frequently on face	2		6	
Whining	4		12	
Cries very easily				
Temper tantrums	3		10	2
Thumb sucking	4		9	4
Fear of dogs	5		3	2
Fear of the dark	4		2	
Nailbiting		1	5	3
Rudeness to grandmother			1	
Refuses milk	3		2	2
Objects to green vegetables	3		1	
Lack of mid-day rest			1	
Showing off			1	
Stands up in high chair				1
Totals	69	4	99	13

[23] Stoltz, Herbert R., M.D.: Director Child Study Institute, University of California, Berkeley.

The difficulties of family life range from the comic to the tragic. We should not be impatient. Only by infusing our task with the utmost patience, generosity, love and courage can we be successful. The movement of parental education is the most hopeful sign in American life to-day.

CHAPTER X

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF PARENTS WHO HAVE SUCCEEDED IN CHANGING THEIR ATTITUDES

To change an attitude toward a problem is to modify the problem itself. The experimental psychologist has found in his laboratory that the *Aufgabe,* or approach to the problem, the way it is set, influences the result. Of equal importance is the attitude, or *Einstellung.* In all matters of learning, recognition, abstraction, and forming judgments, these two psychological factors play a great rôle. Parents should understand their value.

In a school for problem girls where staff conferences were held,[1] it was found that the mere statement of the problem, a description of the difficulties of the girl and background, an analysis of the assets and liabilities in the situation, made her appear less troublesome. Frequently, a few days afterward, substantial improvement would be noted. The question is, had she changed, or her teachers?

Particularly in the world of emotional attitudes and moral viewpoints is our own way tenacious. Change is thrust upon us, and for some time it *feels* wrong, as when we force ourselves to take a correct posture we feel crooked. When parents are urged to assume new attitudes, they say the world seems upside down for a time. This explains why its practice is infrequent. Experiences of the suffer-

[1] For methods of procedure see Van Waters, Miriam: "Youth in Conflict," Republic Publishing Company. New York, 1925, pp. 203-207.

ings and accomplishments of parents in this novel kind of self-discipline should be interchanged. Formal instruction has little effect.

Twenty mothers, on entering a class in parent education,[2] were asked to state their chief problems with reference to their children. Failure to eat, shyness, timidity, over-excitement, stubbornness, disinclination to attend kindergarten, and a few fears were reported. Physical care had already been provided for by their own pediatricians. Their problems were well within the normal range but they wished to do the best possible. Individual conferences were held, and, in addition to attending the lectures, the mothers kept diaries of what happened at home when they tried to put instruction into practice. In cases where the "problem" was of adult origin (it usually was) the parent was asked to keep a record of her own behavior and attitude. At the end of the first year great improvement was recorded, but almost without exception it was said to be the child who had changed. Seemingly the mothers could not grasp the idea of modifying their own behavior, even when it had altered perceptibly. The second year the instructor tried different tactics. The lectures in child growth and development went on, but each mother was required:

First: to write up her own life-history in chronological order, attempting to evaluate her own parent-child relationship. These healthy young women were averse to introspection, but finally achieved it.

Second: to do systematic observation of children in a Nursery School. Some of the mothers had

[2] The majority had university training, and were young women with exceptional cultural advantages.

Nursery Schools of their own, so this was easy.[3] Each one, however, observed children not her own.

Third: analysis of problem cases presented in the Juvenile Court, studies of custody, conflicts, antagonism, leadership and promiscuity in their relation to family life.

Fourth: undertaking some fixed community task, serving on committees and boards of child or family welfare, teaching less privileged mothers, arranging parenthood conferences, and the like.[4]

The third year they not only began to change their attitudes, but were able to interpret them.

As samples of the early days:

"J. was a healthy, lively boy of four, accustomed since infancy to a daily sunbath. At the beach in the summer, a neighbor's boy of the same age made fun of him with the result that a struggle was necessary each day at sunbath time. No amount of arguing would convince him that a sunbath was not a highly unconventional affair. Finally his mother decided to put it up to him: she explained to him carefully the benefits he would derive from the sun; recalled to him that his friends at home all had sunbaths, and tried to make him see that it was the small neighbor that was 'queer'—not he. However,

[3] To Dr. Elizabeth L. Woods and Mrs. Rebecca Earle, the writer owes a debt of gratitude for the excellent facilities furnished in the Nursery School established in the Normandie School, Los Angeles. *See also:* Research Bulletin, Department of Psychology and Educational Research, Los Angeles City Schools, September 1927.

[4] These parents, in coöperation with the local members of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and numerous clubs and organizations, were responsible for the Southern California Conference on Modern Parenthood, held in Los Angeles, December 15 to 18, 1926. They also edited and published the Proceedings.

she told him she would leave it entirely to him—he was old enough to decide for himself whether he would allow one silly boy to deprive him of all the good he might have, or whether he would be old enough and independent enough to do what he knew was best for him. A few days after he came and told his mother he would like to have a sunbath, and since then there has been no trouble. He can't be said to enjoy it, but there are no more struggles."

"S. was an active, healthy, imaginative girl of seven. She was popular at school and resourceful in play. There was nothing she enjoyed as much as having her friends to play with her after school. Normally she was reasonable and obedient, but when her friends were with her she seemed to lose her head entirely, was impertinent and unruly. Her mother had tried to reason with her and had deprived her of having company—without the desired result. It was suggested that it be presented to her in the light that her misbehavior reflected discredit on her home and other mothers did not like their children to associate with those who were inconsiderate and impolite to their parents. The result was most satisfactory: from then on it was necessary to recall the suggestion only a few times, and entertaining small visitors is now a pleasure."

More recent samples:

Madeline and her younger sister had been brought up in a so-called advantaged home. They were children of parents in comfortable circumstances who had the welfare of their children at heart. When Madeline was six and the sister three, a new governess had come into the household. She became very greatly attached to the baby, a truly beautiful child, smiling, friendly, healthy and robust, in

contrast to Madeline's plain appearance and rather delicate health. The governess grew very partial to the baby. Madeline was blamed for every mishap that befell. Madeline was punished for her own errors and for the baby's as well. The parents took the governess' word as the truth when she said that Madeline was continuously at fault.

Madeline's mother was a woman of much charm. She possessed a great deal of affection for her children, but along with it an exceedingly dominating personality. She had been the only daughter of parents who had idolized her. She had grown up to feel that whatever she said and did was right and must be agreed with. She had married a man who continued to "keep her on a pedestal," as it were.

And so in her home, where every advantage was supposedly accorded the children, these two disadvantages played their rôle in influencing Madeline's development, the disadvantages of partiality and domination. Madeline grew up lacking self-confidence, inclined to blame herself constantly, rather afraid of expressing her own opinions, not able to stand up in the face of opposition without a good deal of wear and tear on her nervous energy.

She married, moved to another city. Her first child was born. The child was delicate, most probably also endowed with a highly sensitive nervous system. Madeline turned him over entirely to the care of a so-termed efficient and competent infant's nurse. The child grew, the object of much attention and adulation from the adoring grandparents, the object of many remonstrances and much unwise training from the "treasure" of a nurse, the object of complete and total wonderment on the part of Madeline, who felt that, as she knew nothing about

children, why should she interfere in the bringing up of this child? But she did notice that the child grew, not as most children she saw around her, but "differently." She saw this despite the constant praise of the grandparents and adoring relatives who incessantly were pronouncing the child a paragon of all virtues. She saw that the child was delicate and irritable, and his movements were unsteady and poorly coördinated, that he shrieked and cried a great deal, that he sucked his thumb instead of playing as other children did, that he would go into paroxysms of fear at objects that most children enjoyed, such as a rubber ball, a toy yellow taxicab, a machine on the street.

Timidly she spoke of it to the nurse, who asked what else she thought she could expect from a child with such stomach trouble. Hesitatingly she mentioned it to her mother and was told inconsistently that the baby was perfect, and that all this was her imagination, that she worried and fussed too much altogether, that if she would turn the baby over entirely to the grandparents for a time he surely would improve, etc. And then Madeline happened to breathe her doubts as to the baby's "normalcy" to a friend, who, fortunately, was an understanding person. The friend was interested. And so Madeline talked. She asked if it was usual to have this sort of behavior in an average two-year-old? The friend advised going to a psychologist.

Madeline went. She started also going to classes in parent education. She started reading all sorts of books on allied subjects. She acquired a good bit of knowledge through hard study and much thought, but more important than this, she acquired a feeling that she knew something about bringing up this child

of hers, that she knew just as much, if not more, than the nurse or her parents. She acquired a feeling of confidence in herself and in her ability to cope with the situation.

Under a constructive sort of program the child's behavior became more like that of other children. That increased Madeline's confidence in her power to work out the problem, helped her to look at herself as an adult instead of still a child to be dominated and controlled altogether by other adults.

For with every additional bit of knowledge and confidence in handling the situation that Madeline acquired came just so much more sureness and deftness, bringing with it a sense of stability and quiet to the child who needed this so much." [5]

"During my first little boy's second year—he is now six years old—the "eating problem" made its appearance and became an ever-present nightmare without my having been aware, in the slightest, of the early symptoms or steady encroachments. Jim was born in the East and lived there the first year of his life without the supervision of a good pediatrician, none being available, and when we brought him to Los Angeles to live he was on a most unsatisfactory diet. He had never been a sick baby, but was far from robust. He cried and fretted a great deal as a small baby and when about ten months old, developed a terror of strange faces, particularly men. I could never explain the origin of this, but it was most persistent and his coming West into a large family was very hard on him.

[5] Contributed by Mrs. H. M. Baruch, 1200 S. Gramercy Place, Los Angeles, Calif. Author of "This Business of Eating."—*Children,* 1927: a monthly periodical published in New York of great value to parents.

"Here I put him under the care of a good doctor who straightened out his diet and in six months he was a different child physically. He remained very shy and cried at the sight of strangers. Up until he was eighteen months old, I cannot recall that his eating habits bothered me at all. The situation was too slow of development to permit definite dates, but I remember that it was sometime within the following year—eighteen months—two and a half years,—that Jim began vomiting at meal time. Looking back, I know I was completely bewildered and did not at all connect it with forcing him to eat, for I called the doctor, fearful that something serious might be pending. The doctor's nurse reassured me concerning my fears, but warned me that it might develop into a habit most difficult to break and gave me many simple remedies—soda tablets in water, rest before meals, variety of menu, etc., all of which did no good. I was worried and of course must have shown it. Jim was underweight and I was anxious over every mouthful. Also Mr. F. was not well, our affairs were troubling us, and I was certainly a far from peaceful person.

"By the time Jim was two and a half years every meal was of endless duration if there was no urging and any great insistence started gagging which often ended in vomiting. Sometimes, without the slightest warning, he would complain of a pain and the meal would be lost. He seemed completely unable to control himself, most pathetically willing to do what I wanted if only he were able, and quite at the mercy of something I could not discover.

"At this time I was expecting another baby and had to go to bed for two months. During this time the vomiting did not occur, but he sat for endless

hours over his meals. We had only a young, inexperienced school girl to help in the house and she did entirely as I directed, so while I was never at the table, I kept close watch over everything that went on. When I was finally up again, all through the following months the same situation worried itself along. Every meal found me sitting at the side of Jim, superintending every mouthful, nagging and impatient. Often he would sit over his breakfast until ten o'clock. I tried leaving him alone, I tried putting off his cup of milk, a pet stumbling block, until some other time of day. Nothing altered the situation in the slightest.

"After my second little boy was several months old, I took him to a pediatrician for supervision, and in the course of our conversation I mentioned my difficulties with my other child. His interest and understanding persuaded me to take Jim to him. I did so and he strongly urged me to give up worrying over the problem and stop my forcing of meals, promising me that Jim would never allow himself to starve and would soon give up his lack of appetite. This was asking me to abandon everything that I had always considered essential in my dealings with Jim, and I doubt that I would have been convinced to the point of trial had I not read "The Nervous Child" by Cameron at this time.[6] A little in the spirit of desperation rather than deep conviction I decided to change my ways.

"I think my first efforts to work out these new principles were not very successful, as I remember it. It was all such right-about-face for me that I could hardly execute the order without some hesitation and

[6] Cameron, Hector Charles, M.D.: "The Nervous Child." Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press, London, 1924.

misgivings. The idea of starving my child might seem logical, but it was very hard to do and of course any half-hearted attempts were entirely lost on Jim.

"But I finally did achieve enough faith to be really consistent. Faithfully, three times a day, a meal was set before Jim and he could eat it or not as he wished. After a reasonable time it was removed and he was given nothing between meals. For several days he ate practically nothing, and it took real courage on my part to persist. Then gradually the relieved nerve tension of meal time began to be apparent. Jim began to eat a little on his own initiative and every evidence of the success of my project helped me to make my change of attitude more complete.

"This change was two years ago and they have been two years of remarkable improvement. It has been slow work; both Jim and I had habits of long duration to break. The vomiting soon stopped entirely; occasionally he would gag, watching me to see its effect, and finding it now met with indifference, he soon gave this up; the complaint of a pain now always met with my suggestion that he had better eat no more, so this too was dropped. I think for a long time he consumed no more food than formerly, but certainly under less strained and distressing circumstances.

"About a year ago, Jim had his tonsils and adenoids removed and this put the finishing touch to the picture. He now eats everything put before him promptly and with keen enjoyment.

"As I look back, my mistakes seem so outstanding that I wonder my ordinary, everyday common sense did not tell me what to do. I failed so utterly to understand how my nervousness and anxiety reacted

upon my child and never dreamed of the complex mental processes that combined to defeat my purpose. Of course, this whole story is typical of my attitude in general, I think, and I have tried to change my course in other matters as well. Unfortunately much damage has been done, and the shades of my past mistakes still dog my footsteps."

"Leta's mother, Mrs. Colby, complained that Leta (aged five) was the 'world's worst child.' The friends and neighbors complained that Leta was the world's worst child. Every one complained. Leta, too, complained by whining, fretting, fussing incessantly.

"Then, by some peculiar set of circumstances, Leta's mother decided to take the child to a Habit Clinic in the city in which they lived. It was found at the clinic that a part of Leta's 'badness' was due to her inability to do anything for herself or to entertain herself or to keep herself occupied for more than two seconds at a time. And the reason for this? As follows:

"The mother had been in the habit of constantly breaking into the child's line of attention, of calling her from what she was doing to do something else, making her 'get up' to answer the telephone, or greet a guest or run an errand. The father had inevitably, upon his appearing on the scene, made constant requests for 'hugs and kisses' or for 'fetching his slippers,' and so forth. The grandparents, who were often present, demanded constant 'showing off,' were not content to watch the child engaging in her own pursuits, but must of necessity stimulate her to 'act cutely' for them. The child, consequently, had found it useless to try to work out any problem, no matter

how fascinating, because she knew that some sort of interruption would ensue. Thus gradually she had lost all power to concentrate, to carry any activity to its natural conclusion, to gain the satisfaction derived from accomplishment.

"The mother was made to see her share in the matter. She has tried to coöperate with the clinic. Her attitude has been changed in that she realizes now that the child must have opportunity to follow her own pursuits and can not constantly be at the beck and call of the adults, to amuse and wait on them. She reports improvement in the child and no longer considers her the 'world's worst' problem."

"Our Play School, which consisted of ten preschool children and which has been held for two hours every school morning in the garden of one of the parents, was started by a group of mothers who felt for various reasons that their children needed to be with other children in the right sort of surroundings, doing the right sort of thing in the right sort of way.

"One mother gave, as her reason for wishing her child to join, the statement that he did not know how to play by himself. She said, 'He is happy whenever some one sits right there to entertain him, but the minute he's left alone, he is just at a loss.' Another mother said: 'My child doesn't know how to play with other children. The minute any other child comes around we hear nothing but shrieking and fighting, simply because my boy has never known how to share his things.'

"A third mother, whose child was very shy, thought that the group work would help to overcome his self-consciousness. Another mother had

just the opposite trouble. Her child did not know what it meant to be retiring. He constantly demanded the center of the stage, didn't know how to let others be heard, didn't know how to take turns, constantly interrupted others, and always wanted to show off in some way or another.

"Another mother complained that her child was running out onto the street all morning long, and professed that it would be a relief to know where she was and what she was doing.

"It might be interesting to note the progress made by some of the children since entering the Play School.

"Last year one little girl came with a doll. Another little girl wanted to play with the doll. There was much dissension as a result. This year the same little girl brought the same doll and the other little girl wanted to play with it again. The other little girl, being granted permission to do so, proceeded to build a bed and chairs out of blocks for the doll, the owner proudly looking on. Does this not indicate growth and development?

"The children are all 'little helpers.' They seek to help each other and the teacher (not to mention their own selves). A new child soon begins to volunteer: 'I am a good helper too.' One child recently informed his mother than in 'School' we always put things away where they belong. Another one announced that 'We always finish one thing before starting something else.'

"The bashful child has emerged from his shell. He enters into the conversation without any apparent effort of self-consciousness. His social contact, having begun when he was young, saves him

from becoming an ingrown as he would have been had be been left alone.

"One little boy when he first entered the Play School could not concentrate on any one thing for any length of time at all. In making daisy chains, for instance, he would paste two paper strips together and then be unable to go on. Now he makes just as long chains as any of the others, and has developed quite a degree of 'stick-to-it-iveness.'

"The little boy who always wanted the center of the stage has learned to take his turn and his place as the others do; the little girl who didn't know how to play with other children delights in playing with them now.

"One small child was so anti-socially inclined that at first the teacher had quite a problem with her, as she wanted constantly to pinch, scratch and generally annoy the other children. That has all stopped, however, and she is now one of the most coöperative members of the group.

"One enthusiastic mother even went as far as to say: 'My child eats and sleeps ever so much better since joining the Nursery School.'"

"After visiting all the kindergartens in Pasadena, five of us decided to start our own. There was too much coughing and sniffling in the public school kindergartens—one private kindergarten was a Montessori School, which we considered very limited as to materials and restricted as to freedom for self-expression. Another went to the opposite extreme, we thought, and the children, left to do what they wanted, did not get enough 'technique,' as Alder says, in the way of hand-work, clay modeling, folk dancing, etc.

"The five children were all about five years old. One mother collected them and one conducted the class at her own home each day, returning the children afterward.

"I had had kindergarten training and tried to do the things that the mothers without training had not had experience in. We had singing—very simple songs with easy intervals, so that each child could learn them perfectly, instead of droning the words in a monotone, as often happens. We found that 'The Song Primer' (A. S. Barnes Company), answered this need, though we chose songs from a number of other books.

"For our rhythms we used 'Rhythms of Childhood' by Caroline Crawford and Elizabeth Rose Fagg. In this book the moods of childhood are given expression; also, by characterizing a flying bird, or a feather that floats, or an elephant or a giant through movement, they gain their first art expression.

"For mothers who did not play, there were very good records of skipping, running, galloping rhythms, and music that we let the children interpret as they chose. We also had folk dance records.

"The children enjoyed dramatizing stories more than anything that we did, and if I ever said: 'That is a hard story to play,' were overflowing with suggestions as to how it could be worked out. Every story or song they heard came to mean to them something to be played.

"Every day they had some sort of hand-work. At one house they had paper-folding, pasting and cutting. At another they learned gardening from the beginning and each child planted, cultivated and irrigated his own garden. At another house the

children made doll houses from orange boxes, sawing, hammering and finally painting them. We had planned to paper the inside and make furniture, but the time was too short. They also had clay modeling and painting with water colors. At one house, where there was a French governess, they started to learn some French.

"I think in that short time (two months) the children improved in poise and manners. They overcame embarrassment in saying good-morning and good-by to the different mothers. One child who was diffident and didn't want to come, learned to like it and looked forward to what he was working on at each house. Another child seemed to learn that hitting other children brought unpopularity and ostracism from the group. Self-conscious boys forgot themselves and joined in the rhythms and plays.

"Children that disliked having their own toys played with by the others finally yielded with a very good grace and they all tried to be careful of each other's things.

"The mothers probably gained more than the children, as in our discussions we gained other and more impersonal points of view. We found the children easier to handle in a group than alone and many individual problems turned out not to be problems at all to another mother with a different attitude toward the child.

"We would like to continue the school if possible, after vacation, and see just how much improvement we can notice in hand work, music, originality and inventiveness, initiative and ability to work out problems as well as social adjustments." [7]

[7] Contributed by Mrs. Guy Witte, 531 Arroyo Square, South Pasadena, Calif. The above "case-studies" were all contrib-

As the parents progressed, they had insight into problems of a deeper nature:

George was an adopted boy. He was the exceedingly sensitive and intelligent child of a soldier who had married a trained nurse. Both died during the World War. In babyhood he came into the family of cultured young people, who three years later had a little girl of their own. George was eight, and the girl six when the "trouble" began.

George's temperament was happy, open and frank. The girl was seclusive, did not "confide" in her parents,—ran to her grandmother in everything. The mother resented this. The children played together, were on excellent terms, and in good health. George had a fine relationship to his adopted father. Suddenly one day George was found face down in the bath tub, trying to drown himself. It was no half-hearted attempt. On being taken out he said: "I want my *own* mother." His adopted mother tried to reassure him that her love was so great that she had picked him out of many babies, to make him her "very" own, whereas "her own" had merely been sent by God. Nothing shook George's conviction that he was a superfluous person. Life went on for him in school, play, work and meal-times, but he was miserable. So too were his parents. They attributed it to something inevitable in rearing adopted children. As the mother said: "I have always dreaded this. I did not want George to hear from the neighbors he was not our child, so I told him years ago. He didn't mind at all. Now everything is changed."

Here, in miniature, we see how family-relation-

uted by members of a class in parent-education conducted by the writer in Los Angeles, 1924-1927.

ships may be warped by attitude. The parents had treated George exactly as their own son, yet truthfully faced the fact of adoption. The mother's *anxiety* was the chief factor in spoiling the home. During George's infancy it was non-existent; when her daughter was born she was careful to avoid anything which would make him jealous; in punishing him, she had been mindful of the danger of over- or under-estimating his faults, because of her solicitude to "see him turn out well"; in short, her treatment of George was exceptionally wise. Nevertheless anxiety overcame her. It was born of jealousy of her mother's relation to *her* little girl. The grandmother aided the conflict by treating the children differently. It is noteworthy that none of this hurt the friendship of the children. They were all right; the adults were twisted.

Change of attitude took several months. The young mother had to uproot the last trace of her dependence on her mother, had to change her possessive feeling towards her daughter, welcoming her confidence when it came naturally, placing no obstacles in the flow of affection toward the grandmother, had to grow closer to her husband, who had a good understanding of the situation, and to revise her philosophy of life and throw off fear and the superstition that adopted children are "different." It was a remarkable achievement, and has lessons for all parents.

Dominance of parents by grandparents manifests itself in ways hurtful to children. The daughter of a brilliant, domineering woman, may be fearful lest *her* children be dominated by herself, overanxious about shyness, clumsiness, or spells of melancholy; or she may nag them into indifference, or

"nerves." This is particularly trying on fathers, and spoils some marriages. The mother has to conquer over-tenderness, as well as resentment in her mother-daughter relationship, before she can be a successful parent.

To illustrate the need of changing parental attitudes, let us take masturbation. It is widely prevalent in young children, almost universal. It has no sexual significance as adults use the term. It thrives among lonely children, unwanted, timid, nervous children, but also among the healthy and satisfied. At first it appears as innocent experimentation. When met with adult shame, horror and disgust it may easily become a fixed habit. When treated with cruelty (no one "fault" of childhood has resulted in such monstrous parental abuse, use of mechanical restraints, threats, undue pain, amounting to torture), it may warp the child's development. Parents find it hard to be sane because their attitudes toward sex are distorted. In punishing their children for masturbation they are revenging their own sense of guilt. If they succeed in changing their attitude here they have crossed the hardest bridge.[8]

The faults of children since their study by Child Guidance Clinics and numerous child welfare research centers reveal to us our own faults. If we could compress the results into a single phrase for the general guidance of parents, it would be: Take a new approach. The removal of annoyances from young children, avoidance of provocation, the cele-

[8] For sane treatment of the subject of masturbation in young children see Thorn, Douglas, M.D.: "Everyday Problems of the Everyday Child." Appleton, New York, 1927.

bration of successes, are goals of parental discipline in early years.[9]

To reach them, parents must subordinate their own comfort and ambitions. Parenthood grows increasingly exacting as we glimpse its larger possibilities. No parent should expect a child to be grateful for being born; on the contrary, unless he is ready to devote his best energies to the task, the parent will have to apologize to the child for injury.

With adolescence come new problems of human association. Here the parent-child relationship merges into wider laws of fellowship and socialization. Many people believe that if early childhood receives wise treatment there will be no difficulty in adolescence. I doubt that. There is nothing easy in right human relationships, based on full understanding and equality. Each one is a precious achievement, won rigorously by self-denial, faith, tolerance and love. The parent must prepare himself for an endless journey.

[9] Myers, Garry, Cleveland: "Education of Young Children Through Celebrating Their Successes." Department of the Interior: Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C. City School Leaflet No. 26. July, 1927. Five cents per copy. Myers is head of the Division of Parental Education, Cleveland College, Western Reserve University. This clear, concise little paper is invaluable to young parents.

CHAPTER XI

THE GLORIOUS ADVENTURE OF BEING GROWN UP

As it is necessary for the family to have a goal, a purpose beyond bread-winning and race-perpetuation, so the individual should know what are the standards of maturity. How nearly is any one grown up? We speak of infantile parents, we see evidence of immaturity in current social values; as we observe crowds on the streets the impression grows that every one is seeking to keep "the school-girl complexion," the silhouette of youth, the manners, pleasures and mentality of adolescence. Obviously there is something wrong in a world that gears itself solely for youth, and presents to the adult no goal beyond "rejuvenation." We need not object to this goal on the ground that it is too easy. Its discipline includes rigors of body, slavery to "beauty parlors," fasting and vigil to a point beyond fatigue, an endurance worthy of martyrs to great causes. As a goal, rejuvenation has the advantage of being unattainable, while it calls for our utmost exertion; nevertheless, it is an unworthy goal. It lops off two-thirds of life. Have we nothing better to offer young people than a reduced image of themselves?

In the eighteenth century, for example, who was the "ideal" person? He was a man made familiar to us in the literature of the period, and recaptured in modern writings, such as the portrait of l'Abbé

Jérôme Coignard by Anatole France.[1] He was frankly middle-aged, his contours were ample; he was wise, witty, worldly, and unconsciously saturated with content. Youth flocked to him, imitating his manners and speech, delighting in his conversation. The fruit was felt to ripen and swell with mellowness. There was no popular clamor for picking it green.

Moreover the individual most admired then was completely sane: he had the courage to find "assurance and peace in being what one is, and in becoming what one must become." [2]

Why has middle age lost its attraction? It is because we have not the wit to see it imaginatively in its modern rôle. Jane Addams is a far more appealing figure than ever was the l'Abbé Coignard. One would like to believe that there are young people to-day who catch her quality, and viewing her, let us say, seated at the conferences where she contributes so much wisdom, note the strength pulsating behind her "constructive composure," a selflessness, an indifference as to "how she looks," yet in all her outlines possessing that massive simplicity found only in great sculpture. Drawing nearer they would find a spirit with an appeal to their hunger far more satisfying than the amours, necromancy, piety and wit of the eighteenth-century hero.

To-day the center of culture has shifted; we all exist for the glorification of the very young. The change has been detrimental to every one. No wonder so many young people hesitate to grow up into adults that are so unworthy of imitation as those they see around them.

[1] France, Anatole: "The Queen Pédaugue." Dodd, Mead.
[2] Santayana.

When men train to become "boy-leaders," they imitate the boys, adopt their slang, play their games, try to think their thoughts. The boys tolerate these clumsy attempts of grown men to become "kids," but secretly are they not a little contemptuous and bewildered? If a mature man were suddenly to appear among them, busied with his own concerns, serenely rooted in his own middle age, taking its prestige for granted, how eagerly would youth gather about him if he beckoned.

A woman devotee of the modern cult of remaining young, which is the chief aspect of the "youth movement" in our country, permitted her sufferings to be overheard:

"I have no longer time to read. I cannot even go to my club. I am reducing. On Monday and Thursday evenings I take the baths. Of course the hot water takes the curl out of my hair, so I have to spend Tuesday and Friday afternoons having it marceled. . . .

"I should not have eaten that apple, though I have had nothing since last night. I have *gained* eleven ounces!"

Let no one scoff at these laments. Their absurdity screens tragedy. Let no one say it does not matter what these "useless women" do. They are striving to reach a style of life, to express an ideal in the only way they know. If they should stop caring about "keeping themselves up," if they should decide to "let themselves go," they would lapse into nothingness. They believe they are "keeping their husbands," or the respect of their children. Life as they see it holds nothing else than the waning hope of rejuvenation and its stern privations. They refuse to be defeated by age. Instead of attaining

positions of leadership with their daughters, they are followers. How can we expect youth to follow these wistful, uncertain adults! They are like the politician in the French Revolution who was rebuked for running after the mob, and who said: "I have got to follow them; I am their leader."

Absence of goals suitable to maturity is the natural outcome of our civilization, and should not be blamed to shallowness, restlessness or stupidity of individuals. We overlook the fact that our American civilization has no counterpart, and requires interpreters.[3] The value of clear statement is seen when we remember that upon the amount and degree of self-consciousness we can attain depends our capacity for constructive activity. The unprecedented speed of our disintegration and rebuilding needs a quick eye, an extraordinarily sensitive insight. Workers in clinics and courts often possess these qualities, but most of us miss the significance of the re-making activities of parents and children before us.

A mother in early middle age and a daughter of sixteen came into Juvenile Court. Six months before the father of the family had died in an automobile accident, leaving nothing but his life insurance of six thousand dollars and a little home.

The mother sold the home, and bought herself a car. Her husband had never permitted her to drive. She bought a cheap car for her daughter also. They established themselves in a model apartment and started life on an entirely new plan. Whereas before, "keeping house," was a goal, now it was an

[3] McCracken, Henry Noble: "John, the Common Weal I. The Complaint Against the Times." *Journal of Social Forces*, March, 1927, pp. 359-369.

incident. Pleasure came first. The chief pleasure was meeting and entertaining new "friends." The daughter was more sober in her choices than the mother, who found nothing amiss in any young man. At last the neighbors complained of the victrola, the parties, parked automobiles, lights, and incessant coming and going. A policewoman "raided" the little home, extracting the mother, two sailors, the daughter, and a high-school boy, at three in the morning. Scrutiny of the social-history record showed that the girl's intelligence quotient was slightly higher than the mother's, but the mother had completed secondary school. Her parents had reared her strictly. When she was "given away in marriage" by her father it was to a man no less dominant than himself. She had never gone shopping alone. All her activities had been chaperoned. She hardly knew how to write a check, take a train, or order a meal. Literally she had never been alone a day in her life. Outwardly complacent, she had built up a passionate longing for freedom. On the day of her husband's death she took charge of her own affairs with the downrightness of Queen Victoria ordering her mother off after her coronation. What followed was the result of time and place. Her neighbors were new-comers. They had "failed to adjust" back home, or were seeking adjustments under the California sun. They were all just recovering from illness, bankruptcy, divorce, failure, or scandal. They all had the exuberant sense of new life after a catastrophe, and its tolerance of anything except gloom. "Oh, let us no longer be narrow-minded!" they seemed to be saying. The court suggested to the mother that her broadmindedness had carried her to the door of the jail. She

protested her innocence, yet this did not save her from several months sentence for "contributing to the delinquency" of her daughter. All her money was gone. When finally she was released, in the custody of a probation officer, she settled down, earned her living in the telephone office, and made a home for her girl.

Viewing her case in retrospect, the mother said: "I lost my head. Mary [my daughter] used to say —'Mother, you ought to go to work.' But six thousand dollars looked so big. I thought it would last at least a year. I was so tired of being bossed. I missed Henry, of course, but couldn't see any harm in having a good time. I don't know why all my friends turned against me. They did the same things."

It is pitiful to know that her graduation into maturity cost such a price, yet, granted the conditions, it was inevitable.

Do many parents ask themselves: what does my child do when he is left alone in the house? What indeed does any one do when unobserved? It is an interesting test of the degree of maturity reached; in the child it foreshadows the nature of his goal of freedom. A shy child sent to a foster home, believing herself unobserved, carefully cut her toe-nails and tied the parings in her handkerchief. Other children talk out loud, play with imaginary companions, gesticulate and dance. Almost all children behave as if some great weight were lifted. Adults, in the same circumstances, smoke, take a drink, cut themselves great sandwiches, do aimless things which appear to have no meaning, yet afford them such satisfaction that, if the door were abruptly opened, they would be furious. Indeed a wise man

has said it is saddening to open any door suddenly . . . however great or revered is the individual concealed behind it. Most of us would admit it was an exceptional person who could be seen acting in Cathay exactly as he would in Cincinnati. There is a great deal of difference in individuals in the amount of bliss they can endure. If we were truly grown up, why should it be so blissful to do as we please unobserved?

Parental interference must be blamed to a great extent for our not growing up. Parents prevent children from getting enough outlet for human cravings so they can be fed and forgotten. Buried beneath the surface in childhood is so much sex-curiosity that many adults perpetually titillate themselves with jokes, allusions and innuendoes, to the extent that healthy people, later on, can hardly engage them in conversation. Fighting is nearly always prohibited in childhood, yet to-day a fight will empty every brothel, pool-hall, saloon, or public gathering, it is so alluring to the majority of adult males.

Psychiatrists have traced for us the beginning of the split or divided personality. It occurs often in childhood, without any one being aware, and manifests itself in adulthood as mental disease. Because it is so frequently seen in selfish, ego-centric, destructive personalities, we tend to abominate it without stopping to inquire whence it came. Normal adults all show numerous selves, coexisting.

Winston writes: "My younger self is only twelve years old. This is my real self. To my own mind I am still a little girl with short dresses and bunches of curls. For some reason my idea of self has never advanced beyond this point. The long dress and the hair piled high will never seem natural. . . . I am

at one and the same time pupil and teacher, offender and judge, performer and critic, chaperon and protegée, a prim, precise, old maid and a rollicking school girl, a tomboy and a prude, a saint and a sinner. . . . I can but wonder and enjoy and wait and see what Myself and I will make of Me." [4]

Now where would an understanding parent scent danger in this description? Obviously it is written by a self-conscious adult who has known in youth a parental repertoire of epithets of praise and blame. These moralizing judgments are "at once the results and implements" of our gradual social improvement, but, unless used with discrimination by parents, they make a child over-sensitive to his own personality. Hence he never grows up. This writer is still absorbed in projecting her personality;—the "bunches of curls" and the "hair piled high," are the symbols of her extension. Why this preoccupation with the impression she is making? Who cares about it anyway? In order to grow up in face of nagging prohibitions and adult encroachment, she has had to focus her attention on her self, of all objects the most fruitless and devastating.

Fortunately the modern child is throwing off this subservience to adult observation. The "projections of personality" of the passing flapper, now reduced in outline to the demands of speed and trimness, are all that we have to remind ourselves of the age-old struggle.[5] In general we may say that the exaggerated importance youth receives to-day in the minds of adults, is the outcome of their own desires

[4] Winston, L. G.: "Myself and I." *American Journal of Psychology,* XIX, 1908, pp. 562-63.

[5] Blanchard, Phyllis, Ph.D.: "The Flapper and Social Evolution," *Journal of Applied Sociology.* May-June, 1927.

to escape parental authority. They have become vaguely conscious of past restrictions and are eager for power. They have hit upon youth as a model because youth seems to represent freedom.

But is there no period of modern life worthy of imitation except adolescence? It is useless to pretend that youth is not the special shine of life, hypocritical to deny that its loss is foretaste of death. But what have we to offer youth, which gives us so much, this twentieth-century youth which has set our feet to dancing, and has aroused jazz-moods of unquenchable yearning in us all? We should learn to keep our place: "To be, to do, to do without, and to depart." Is this our goal, as John Morley says? Youth has a right to outstrip us in speed. The young will hit harder, run faster, climb higher mountains with less fatigue. Nothing can be a substitute for youth. We must lower, or at least modify our concept of felicity. Life is something beyond mere duration; quality must be reckoned with.

Around what kind of human being should the culture and zest of the twentieth century revolve? We have little to guide us from the past. We are dependent on sources of inspiration entirely outside ancient calculation, or even the goals of modern mental hygiene. What shall be the goal of our individual development?

There is the doctrine of adjustment. It is said we must adjust to society. "From the self-centered isolation of infancy" we should proceed to "full communion with his fellow creatures." We must adjust to "potential things," for example marriage and careers. Whether we actually marry or have a career does not matter, so long as we are able to adjust to the potential mate, or the potential career.

Finally we must adjust to the infinite. "Nor is his adjustment adequately made if he carries through life a conception founded primarily on childish experience; the conception of a God who is identified either with the severity or with the indulgence of his parents." [6]

But are "adjustments" adequate as goals? Perhaps. Owing to the exceeding youth of human association, to the fact that man's home has just been explored, we may be content with such statements. We are still adventurers, and escape from catastrophe is important enough to be conceived as goal. In our modern world it is as true as in riding the old open whaling boats: "Only by a certain self-adjusting buoyancy and simultaneousness of volition and action can you escape." [7]

We still have nothing with which to compare the modern adventure of growing up except a battle, or an exploit by sea or land. It is the wrong analogy. When we link ourselves to our fellow human beings for constructive purposes in modern society, the symbols of war and adventure have no more meaning than tinsel on a Christmas tree. We need new symbols and analogies.

The type of courage demanded of modern parents, educators and social workers is something beyond facing gun-fire. The individual who attempts to build anything in modern communities, to attempt research, a thesis, a bridge, a church, a school, a rat-trap, or even a dug-out to hide his coffee pot in,

[6] Miller, H. Crichton: "The New Psychology and the Teacher." Thomas Seltzer, New York, 1922. The author is here discussing the "three principal adjustments which are demanded of the complete human being." (Pp. 76-77.)

[7] Melville, Herman: "Moby Dick." The Modern Library, New York, p. 282.

must face manfully the likelihood of arousing the envy of his fellow men, and see it wiped out; yet he must resume his activities without despair or cruelty.

We talk of adventure abroad. The most glorious adventure is staying at home and concerning ourselves with building a structure, dependent upon human relationships. The modern man must concern himself with the predicament of his fellow creatures. To the romanticist there is more challenge to adventure in the beating of tom-toms in the jungle than in the sound of the dredge tearing down the hillside covered with wild flowers, to make place for a city street, or the sound of the steel rivets going into the jail next your office window; but to the modern citizen, these are concrete signs of a challenge to his full manhood. In other words we may say to the adult of to-day: "Do you want adventure? Look about you. If you busy yourself in what is called 'doing good,' you may be forced to retire like Thoreau, who said that he had tried and given it up; it was not good for his health; or you may join in the ranks of those who insist that making a contribution to human welfare is a worth-while occupation."

All persons are divided in any given social undertaking into two classes, passengers and crew. There is mutual misunderstanding. The crew think the passengers a nuisance; the passengers are offended by the sailors' jokes, pipes and toddy-drinking. In shipwreck they have a different opinion. So with co-workers resisting a common disaster: old prejudices, griefs and enmities slip away. But to grow up in modern society requires ability to work together when there is no shipwreck. Leaders and followers, passengers and crew, must constantly in-

terchange places. And we must have a different concept of our task: no one must be *defeated.*

The mistake made commonly by those who feel responsible for bringing about the new social order is self-righteousness. We would progress faster if we did away with intellectual and moral snobbery, as Gibran suggests in speaking of good and evil:

"But let not him who longs much say to him who longs little, 'Wherefore are you slow and halting?'

"For the truly good ask not the naked, 'Where is your garment?' Nor the houseless, 'What has befallen your house?' " [8]

When we learn that nothing is gained in social welfare by humiliating or injuring any human being we have begun to grow up.

Perhaps "glorious" is too gaudy a word to be applied to any lengthy period of life: It has been reserved for moments of buoyancy. Maturity, that is to say full consciousness of the powers and responsibilities possible to the human adult in modern civilization, is a glorious adventure. Childishly, most of us have seemed to overlook it. Many people are so barricaded behind the interests, fears, loves, hates, thrown up in defensive struggles against parents, or in attempts to win their love, that they cannot make the transition. They are so relieved at having escaped childhood, they refuse to proceed beyond youth. Parental severity has had only a small part in this barricade. Fundamentally it is due to lack of participation in family life. Hence we grow up only physically and mentally, rarely to full stature socially.

Maturity and childhood have much in common.

[8] Gibran, Kahlil: "The Prophet": Alfred A. Knopf. New York, 1925, p. 74.

Zest for new experience, desire for warmth, joy in building, a vibrating response to beauty, are as characteristic of all great adults as they are of healthy children. To grow up does not imply loss of the fundamental attributes of childhood. It is robustness and humility added to sensitivity. "Except ye become as little children" is still the condition of our entry into complete humanity.

CHAPTER XII

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

"FINDINGS and recommendations" are now in order, to use the phrasing of the referee's report to the judge.

The judge makes the decision. Like the early English King in his court of Chancery, he hopes the decision will be *equitable,* and that the referee has duly considered the rights and personalities of all concerned, as in the case of the petition of one Tyrell, who complained against "certain grete wrongs and griefs doon unto him." How modern is the King's letter to his chancellor, directing him to hear the case in such wise that the petitioner should: "have all that he ought to have of right . . . and suffreth no man to do hym wrong in no wyse, touching the mattere contened in his said sufflication, etc." and "so that he have no cause for lak of right to retourne hider ayein unto us compleyning." [1]

Certainly the modern referee is not hampered by legal tradition, nor precedents of the common law. That is why a referee, formerly used chiefly in complicated matters involving insolvency, suits in equity and the like, is now attached to many Juvenile and Domestic Relations courts. In general, the Court instructs the referee to "Go to the bottom of the case, employ your own methods of investigation, arrive

[1] Cited by Henderson, John G., LL.D.: "Chancery Practice," 1904. T. H. Flood and Company, Chicago, p. 77.

at your conclusions uninfluenced by what any other court may have done or said in the premises. In a case involving so many complicated issues as this, the responsibility for a just decision must rest upon the master; he alone can devote the time and study necessary to a thorough understanding of the whole case."

Alas for masculine expectations: when human families are involved, however thorough may be methods of investigation, or unhampered the outlook, nothing can be settled "once for all"; again and again will parents and children "retourne hider . . . compleyning."

This, then, is our first finding: the relation between the parents and children requires perpetual mutual adjustment. Communities must be patient. Science and social work may assist, the newer legal attitudes toward the rights of childhood during minority will be of tremendous help, but fundamentally the changes in family life, considered socially desirable, must come by the growth process in individuals.

In the treatment of children all force and violence are misplaced. What Dean Kirchwey says of our current criminal procedure: "No recognition has been given the criminological principle of individualization of treatment . . . punishment, not understanding and correction, has been the aim," [2] was, until recently, true of parents in dealing with their offending children. Our Juvenile Courts have changed their attitude toward children more fundamentally than parents in general have.[3]

[2] Kirchwey, George W.: "Breasting the Crime Wave." *Survey Magazine,* New York, April 15, 1927, pp. 69-71.

[3] For an excellent, brief account which should be read by

The importance of this change cannot be grasped all at once. It may take half a century of concerted effort to see it work its way into all courts, homes and schools. Like Christianity it demands a change in philosophy and in individuals. To young parents, who, having learned to live for the welfare of their children, turn their energies to advance the position of all childhood, comes the supreme challenging opportunity. If some perish in the struggle against organized political power, or individual ignorance and greed, it will be a very "precious perishing."

It is obvious that a grosser kind of family life can do without knowledge of mental hygiene or a fine sense of human relationships. The race has muddled along without them for thousands of years, but as long as there are people found who resent the happiness of children our task is not ended.

The complexities of modern family life should not baffle us. It is true our relationships are involved. No Australian savage had a harder time. We see the ex-stepgrandmother seeking custody of a child from the second divorced husband of the child's mother. But the important thing is that the child should be valued.

When people treat children badly it is often because they hate someone of whom the child reminds

all parents, see Mack, Judge Julian W.: "The Juvenile Court." *Harvard Law Review,* December, 1909, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, pp. 104-123. For a summary of legal decisions supporting the principle that the state, as *Parens Patriæ,* is invested with the supreme guardianship and supervision of minors, and that the processes of the law are put in motion for his protection and welfare rather than punishment, even in the most serious offences, *murder,* for example, *see:* 194 California. Reports of the Supreme Court, Pub. Bancroft-Whitney Company, San Francisco, 1925, *in re* Daedler: pp. 321-332.

them. When we learn to value children in their own personalities we shall do better.

Viewing the struggles of parents to fit themselves for their responsibilities, we can readily conclude they are worthy of probation. Centuries of tradition hamper them. Their chief difficulty is the "possessive principle," but, as Galsworthy notes in his "The Forsyte Saga": "it is putting up its shutters." Slowly does the attitude of the artist and the scientist make its way among parents.

Parents are in a new position in the modern world; to help them "make good," is the object of all our institutions. Under the circumstances, our only recommendation is to have continued faith in the integrity of human life.

BOOK LIST

BOOK LIST

The following titles are suggested as an introduction to the general theme of parental education. It is far from complete. Books which the writer has found of especial value for teaching purposes are marked with an asterisk.

* ADLER, ALFRED, M.D.
The Neurotic Constitution. Character and Talent. Harper's Magazine, N. Y., June, 1927.

* BALDWIN, BIRD, PH.D. and STECHER, L. I.
Psychology of the Pre-School Child. Appleton, N. Y., 1924.

BLANTON, SMILEY and GRAY, MARGARET.
Child Guidance. Century, N. Y., 1926.

BLATZ, DR. W. E.
Director—Parent Education & Nursery School Division. St. George's School for Child Study. 47th St. George St., Toronto, Canada. Unpublished work in the problem of evaluating family life. For information, write to Dr. Blatz, direct.

* BURNHAM, WILLIAM H., PH.D.
Success and Failure as Conditions for Mental Health. Pamphlet. National Committee for Mental Hygiene, New York.
* *The Normal Mind.* Macmillan, N. Y., 1925.
* *Great Teachers and Mental Health.* Macmillan, N. Y.
Dr. Burnham's point of view is that of the great teacher. He is the exponent of training.

* CALHOUN, ARTHUR W., PH.D.
A Social History of the American Family from Colonial Times to the Present, in 3 vols. Arthur H. Clark Co., Cleveland, 1917-1919.
This book is a mine of source material on American family life. It should be read by those who take a catastrophic view of modern conditions. It is an excellent corrective of a short-distant view.
Vol. I, p. 40: "The later Puritanism distorted childhood. . . . The seventeenth century in Europe was an age of precocity. The Puritans, as we shall see in the colo-

nies, were ready to promote this tendency. The fear of infant damnation made necessary the earliest possible conversion of the child . . . it was in Puritan households that the rod was most favored: for were not the little ones until conversion children of wrath, requiring to have the devil well whipped out of them."

Vol. I, Chap. VI: The Status of Children in The New England Colonial Family, pp. 105-129. Page 120: For incorrigible disobedience to parents the colonists, in accordance with Moses and Calvin, prescribed the death penalty. See Connecticut statute.

Vol. II, Chap. X: The Reign of Self-Indulgence, pp. 201-242. Page 238: A description of hotel- and boarding-house life, a striking phenomenon of the generation before the Civil War. The feebleness of the domestic tie between parents and children is noted by writers of 1842, pp. 238-241.

Vol. III, Chap. IV: The New Basis of American Life, pp. 65-85. Chapter VII: The Career of the Child, pp. 131-157. Chapter VIII: The Passing of Patriarchism and Familism, pp. 157-179. Chapter IX: The Precarious Home, pp. 179-199. At the conclusion of each volume is an excellent bibliography.

CAMERON, HECTOR CHARLES, M.D.
The Nervous Child. Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. (Oxford Medical Publications—3rd edition, 1924.)

CAMPBELL, C. MACFIE, M.D.
Experiences of the Child: How They Affect Character and Behavior. Pamphlet. National Committee for Mental Hygiene.

* CHAMBERLAIN, ALEXANDER.
The Child. Macmillan Co.
In this book will be found a summary of the research and opinion of workers in child study throughout the world up to the time of its publication. It is a veritable mine of information.

CHAPIN, HENRY DWIGHT, M.D.
Heredity and Child Culture. E. P. Dutton, 1922. With a foreword by Henry Fairfield Osborn. See especially Chapter III: Social Inheritance, pp. 21-34.

* *The Child, the Clinic and the Court.* A symposium on juvenile delinquency, New Republic, Inc., N. Y., 1925.

The Children's Foundation:
The Child: His Nature and His Needs. Valparaiso, Indiana, 1926.

COLCORD, JOANNA C.
Broken Homes. Russell Sage Foundation, N. Y., 1919.
A study of family desertion and its social treatment. Of value to teachers and social workers. Educated parents will find it suggestive in its treatment of causes of broken homes. It confutes the notion that desertion is more prevalent among our foreign-born parents.
Concerning Parents: Symposium on Present-day Parenthood. Conference on parent education held under auspices of the Child Study Association of America. New Republic, Inc., N. Y., 1926.

COOLEY, EDWIN J.
Probation and Delinquency. Published by Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of N. Y., 1927.
This book shows the difference between probation, the perfunctory, political, time-serving kind of work we get in countless American communities, work which makes every one tend to discredit science and mercy; and probation, the painstaking reconstruction of human lives. Parents should read this book.

DEARDOFF, NEVA, PH.D.
Bound Out. Survey. July 15, 1926.

DE LIMA, AGNES.
Our Enemy the Child. New Republic, Inc., N. Y., 1926.

DEVINE, EDWARD T., PH.D.
The Family and Social Work. Survey Associates, Inc., 1912.

EAST, EDWARD M.
Mankind at the Cross Roads. Scribner's, N. Y., 1924.
Dr. East is a professor in Harvard University. He attacks the fallacies of a one-sided, ill-considered eugenics with its "circulating propaganda of a singularly pernicious type." His Chapter XI, The Welfare of the Family, pp. 318-339, deserves careful study. Dr. East is among those who believe that an indispensable requisite for the reform of our social order and of family life is voluntary parenthood. "If the human race really desires a continued progress, a fair chance, and a longer and happier life for every individual, the birth-rate must come down faster and faster."
He has a wealth of data to support his conviction. The book is sane and courageous and young parents should read it.

ELLIS, HAVELOCK.
Little Essays of Love and Virtue. George H. Doran, 1922, N. Y.
See especially Chapter I: Parents and Children.

FENTON, JESSIE M., PH.D.
Practical Psychology of Babyhood. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1925.

FINOT, JEAN.
Problems of the Sexes. (Translated by Mary J. Safford.) G. P. Putnam Sons, N. Y., 1913.
This old book has many useful illustrations and is courageous and hopeful in viewpoint.

*FISHER, DOROTHY CANFIELD.
Mothers and Children. Henry Holt, N. Y., 1914.
A Montessori Mother. Henry Holt, N. Y.

*FLUGEL, J. C.
The Psychoanalytic Study of the Family. Published by Leonard and Virginia Woolf, London, 1926.
Here the relations between parents and children and brothers and sisters come in for much attention. This is an excellent discussion of the attitude of parents to children, pp. 156-174; and of the origin and development of family tendencies in their hate and love aspects, pp. 175-199. The treatment of the repression of love is significant, pp. 200-216.

*FOSTER, SYBIL.
Personality Deviations and Their Relation to the Home. Pamphlet: National Committee for Mental Hygiene.
Miss Foster works with Dr. Douglas Thom in the Habit Clinic of Boston. Watching her at work it is easy to see why many children are improved by her quiet and gentle handling.

FOSTER, WILLIAM TRUFANT, PH.D.
The Social Emergency: Studies in Sex Hygiene and Morals. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1914.
A series of 10 lectures, edited by Dr. Foster.
Our point of view toward Social Hygiene has changed since these were written. They are of value as marking a transitional stage in our thinking about sex education for young people.

*GESSELL, ARNOLD L., PH.D.
Mental Growth of the Pre-School Child. Macmillan, N. Y., 1925.

*GIBRAN, KAHIL.
The Prophet. Knopf, N. Y.
A sensitive interpretation of human relations which rings true. In our maladjusted moments we will find this little book of more value than most treatises on mental hygiene.

GOODSELL, WILLYSTINE, PH.D.
A History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution. Macmillan Co., N. Y., 1915.
Contains a good deal of useful historical material of value to those who cannot have access to the sources on which it is based.

GROVES, ERNEST R., PH.D.
* *Personality and Social Adjustment.* Longmans, Green, N. Y.
The Drifting Home. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
* *Social Problems of the Family.* Lippincott, Philadelphia
Books by Ernest R. and Gladys H. Groves:
Wholesome Childhood. Houghton Mifflin.
Wholesome Marriage. Houghton Mifflin. (In press, to be published in the fall of 1927.)
Wholesome Parenthood. (In preparation.)

* GRUENBERG, BENJAMIN G., PH.D.
Guidance of Childhood and Youth.
* *Outlines of Child Study.* Macmillan Co., N. Y., 1927.

* GRUENBERG, SIDONIE M.
Your Child To-day and To-morrow.

HALL, FRED S. and BROOKE, ELISABETH.
American Marriage Laws in Their Social Aspects. Russell Sage Foundation, 1919.

HART, JOSEPH K.
Adult Education. Thomas Y. Crowell Co., N. Y., 1927.
See especially Chapter XI: Practical Programs of Adult Education, pp. 241-262.

HAVILAND, MARY S.
Character Training in Childhood. Small, Maynard Co., Boston, 1921.
Concrete, detailed and practical. A fairly good book for parents.

* HEALY, WILLIAM, M.D.
Mental Conflicts and Misconduct. Little, Brown, Boston.

JORDAN, ARTHUR MELVILLE.
Children's Interests in Reading. University of North Carolina: Social Study Series, 1921.

KEMPF, EDWARD J., M.D.
Psychopathology. C. V. Mosby Co., St. Louis, 1921.
Distorted in viewpoint, technical in treatment, the writer still has much to give, particularly in presentation of case material.

* KENWORTHY, MARION E., M.D.
Mental Hygiene in Childhood. The Mental Hygiene of Illegitimacy. Pamphlets: National Committee for Mental Hygiene.

* KIRKPATRICK, E. A., PH.D.
Fundamentals of Child Study. Macmillan, N. Y.

* KOFFKA, KURT.
The Growth of the Mind: An Introduction to Child Psychology. Translated by Robert Morris Ogden. Harcourt, Brace, N. Y., 1925.

* LINDEMAN, EDUARD.
Social Discovery. New Republic, Inc., N. Y., 1924.
The process of the search for truth, its discovery in group discussion is here indicated with the writer's gift for stripping things to their fundamentals.

LINDEMAN, EDUARD.
The Meaning of Adult Education, New Republic, Inc., N. Y., 1926.
This deeply thoughtful book will be cherished by those who are concerned with the philosophy of education for parents.

LOFTHOUSE, W. F.
Ethics and the Family. Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1912.
See especially Chapter XI: Some Concrete Problems. Chapter XII: The Future of the Family.
A conservative treatment of family problems from the ethical point of view.

LOU, HERBERT H., PH.D.
Juvenile Courts in the United States: Their Laws and Practice. University of North Carolina Press, 1927.
Parents must understand the Juvenile Court of their Community. Dr. Lou's book is the first comprehensive critical account which has appeared.

* MEYER, ADOLF.
Suggestions of Modern Science Concerning Education. Macmillan, N. Y., 1918.
All that Dr. Meyer writes is packed with wisdom. His suggestions on how to study personality are most important.
See also: What Can a Democracy Do About Eugenics and Child Welfare? Pamphlet: National Committee for Mental Hygiene.
Modern Parenthood. Proceedings of the Southern California Conference on Parenthood, Los Angeles, 1926.

Distributed by the Southern California Society for Mental Hygiene, 632 Consolidated Building, Los Angeles, California, Dr. J. D. Dunshee, Secretary.

MORGAN, J. B. PH.D.
The Psychology of the Unadjusted School Child. Macmillan, N. Y.

MILLER, HUGH CRICHTON.
The New Psychology and the Teacher. Thomas Seltzer, N. Y., 1922.

* PARSONS, ELSIE CLEWS, PH.D.
The Family: an ethnographical and historical outline with descriptive notes, planned as a textbook for the use of college lecturers and of directors of home reading clubs. G. P. Putnam's Sons, N. Y., 1912.
A critical, scholarly treatment of a vast amount of scientific research by others. It is useful to class-leaders, and is presented with sanity.

* PARSONS, ELSIE CLEWS.
Social Freedom. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1915.
A study of the conflicts between social classifications and personality. An exceedingly suggestive little book of 106 pages. Of especial significance are the chapters on Age, Sex, Kin and Friendship.

PATRI, ANGELO.
School and Home. Appleton, N. Y.
Proceedings of Intelligent Parenthood.
The Mid-West Conference of Parent Education, March, 1926. University of Chicago Press.

READ, MARY L.
Mothercraft Manual. Little, Brown, Boston.

* ROOT, WILLIAM T., JR., PH.D.
A Psychological and Educational Survey of 1916 Prisoners in the Western Penitentiary of Pennsylvania. Published by the Board of Trustees of the Western Penitentiary, 1925.
Dr. Root shows the need of a thoroughgoing revision of our treatment of the offender, particularly when he is young.

* ROSANOF, A. J., M.D.
A Manual of Psychiatry. 6th Edition, 1927. John Wiley & Sons, N. Y.
A technical discussion of the subject matter of psychiatry with illuminating flashes of insight and sympathy for those who have the wit to look for them. The complete sanity and humanness of the writer are apparent.

* Russell, Bertrand.
Education and the Good Life. Boni and Liveright, N. Y., 1926.
An indispensable book in the process of educating parents.

Saleeby, Caleb Williams.
Parenthood and Race Culture. Moffat, Yard, 1909.

Spencer, Anna Garlin.
The Family and Its Members. Lippincott, Philadelphia, 1923.
An excellent treatise for reference.

* Taft, Jessie, Ph.D.
The Relation of the School to the Mental Health of the Average Child. Pamphlet: National Committee for Mental Hygiene.
* *Sex in Children.* Reprinted from the World To-morrow.
No one writes more sanely about sex than Dr. Taft. Her brilliance and simplicity, her gift for lucid statement, and her fearlessness make her exceptionally able to furnish parents with material and viewpoints they can accept. See also her recent study of an Antagonistic Mother-Daughter Relationship.

* Thom, Douglas A., M.D.
Everyday Problems of the Everyday Child. Appleton, N. Y., 1927.
Dr. Thom is director of the habit-clinics for the pre-school children of Boston. Every word of this book is important. Beginning with a statement of the relative importance of heredity and environment and the discussion of habit-formation, we are instructed in the everyday problems of feeding, sleep, enuresis, thumb-sucking and nail-biting, obedience and discipline, anger, fear, jealousy, destructiveness, inferiority, personality changes following illness, delinquency, sex, intelligence and conduct, toys and companions. There is a brief bibliography of chosen worth. This book is simply invaluable. It is by all odds the best that has appeared in English in its field. Dr. Thom does not speculate on what might happen. He starts in from what is and gives immediately practical suggestions for treatment. He is primarily a healer of little children. Dr. Thom's treatment of the subject of masturbation will be found helpful to parents, teachers and foster-parents.
* *Three Problem Children: Narratives from a Child Guidance Clinic.* Publication 2: Joint Committee on Methods of Preventing Delinquency, 50 East 42nd Street, N. Y., 1924.

Clinical reports on Mildred, Sidney and Kenneth. These narratives give some indication of the resources which modern science offers in dealing with unhappy, troublesome children. The point of view challenges the traditional methods of discipline and indicates that bad behavior may reflect chiefly the bad handling of the child's problem by parents or teachers.

VAN WATERS, MIRIAM, PH.D.
Youth in Conflict. New Republic, Inc., N. Y., 1925.
What the Juvenile Court Has to Say to Parents. The Methodist Advocate, 1926.
Articles on parent-child relationships appearing in the Survey Graphic Magazine, N. Y., 1926-1927.

VAN SENDEN THEIS, SOPHIE.
How Foster Children Turn Out. A study by the State Charities Aid Association, 105 E. 22nd St., N. Y., 1924. Publication No. 165.

* WEMBRIDGE, ELEANOR ROWLAND.
Other People's Daughters. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1927. A sympathetic insight into the personalities and problems of the girls of haphazard homes. Dr. Wembridge is Referee of the Juvenile Court in Cleveland, Ohio.

* WHITE, WILLIAM A.
Childhood: The Golden Period for Mental Hygiene. Pamphlet: National Committee for Mental Hygiene.
* *The Mental Hygiene of Childhood.* Little, Brown, Boston.

WICKES, FRANCES G.
The Inner World of Childhood. Appleton, N. Y., 1927. A study in Analytical Psychology with an Introduction by Carl G. Jung.

WILE, IRA, M.D.
The Challenge of Childhood: Studies in Personality and Behavior. Thomas Seltzer, N. Y.

* WILLIAMS, FRANKLIN, M.D.
Mental Hygiene and Childhood: A Radio Talk. Pamphlet: National Committee for Mental Hygiene, N. Y.

* WISE, RABBI STEPHEN S.
Child versus *Parent.* Macmillan, N. Y., 1922.

* WOOLLEY, HELEN THOMPSON.
Enuresis as a Psychological Problem. Pamphlet: National Committee for Mental Hygiene, N. Y.
An Experimental Study of Children. Macmillan, N. Y., 1926.
To this writer with her amazing skill in interpretation of

child life, American parents owe a debt they can never pay.

* YEOMANS, EDWARD.
Shackled Youth. Atlantic Monthly Press, Boston, 1921,
This extraordinary book should be possessed by every parent and teacher.

INDEX

INDEX

Addams, Jane, 301
Adler, Dr. Alfred, 77
Adler, Felix, 262
American legal decisions, 123
Andrus, Ruth, 269
Antagonism, 166, 188
Architecture, 117
Artists, 104
Aufgabe, 280
Authority, parental, 80, 123

Banning, Hugh, 48
Baruch, Mrs. H. M., 286
Bateman, Bill, 112
Beatty, Hannah J., 171
Birney, Alice McLellan, 261
Black, Jack, 67
Blackstone, 119
Blanchard, Phyllis, 22, 307
Blatz, Dr. W. E., 27
Bovet, Pierre, 47
Breckinridge, Sophinsba P., 21
Brown, Sibyl Clement, 215, 247
Burgess, Ernest W., 30, 181
Burnham, William, 29, 47, 52
Butler, William, 253

California law, 124, 125, 126
Cameron, 288
Chamberlain, Alexander, 101, 107
Chancery, 313
Cheney, Chas. H., 117
Chesterton, G. K., 3
Clark, Willis, 26
Coignard, l'Abbe, 301
Constructive leadership, 227
Cooley, Edwin, 42
Crabbs, Lelah Mae, 274
Cruelty, 35, 40, 110
Custody of Children, 35, 119

Daedler case, 315
Defective children, 42
Delinquency and leadership, 240
De Schweinitz, 13
Dewey, John, 52
Durant, Will, 254

Earle, Rebecca, 282
Einstellung, 280
Eldon, Lord Chancellor, 35
Ellis, Havelock, 96
Emory, E. Van Norman, 115
Exhaustion, 109

Family formation, 96
Fatalistic attitude, 69
Faulty characterization, 65
Federation for Child Study, 265
Ferriani, 108
Fisher, Carol S., 171
Fiske, John, 107
Flexner, Abraham, 105
Forel, 250
France, Anatole, 301
Froebel, 271
Frost, Dorothy Crowley, 170
Fuller, Rev. Thomas, 13

Gans, Mrs. Bird Stein, 262
Gesell, Arnold, 272
Gibran, Kahil, 311
Glueck, Bernard, 15, 41
Gruenberg, Benjamin, 260

Haefner, Ruth, 267, 275
Haggerty, M. E., 21
Hall, G. Stanley, 271
Hamilton, Gilbert, 51, 181
Hatred, 175

Heart Clinics, 72
Henderson, John G., 313
Hendrick, Nell, 216
Hobhouse, L. T., 251
Humiliation, 207

James, Henry, 95
Juvenile Court House, 257

Kempf, Edward, 176, 249
Kenworthy, Marion, 194
Keyserling, 13
Kirchwey, George, 42, 314
Koffka, Kurt, 45

La Bruyere, 101
Leadership, 212
Lissner, Dr. Harry, 72
Lindeman, Eduard, 37, 212
Lombard, Ellen C., 262
Loyalty, 84

Mack, Judge Julian, 314
Manage, 95
Masefield, John, 46
Massachusetts, 112
Masturbation, 50, 298
McCracken, Henry Noble, 303
Melville, Herman, 309
Merrill-Palmer School, 273
Meyer, Adolph, 32, 45, 77
Miller, H. Crichton, 309
Miller, Mabel Lawrence, 274
Moulton, Mrs. Gladys, 102
Monies, 101, 102, 103, 108
Myers, Garry, 299

Negativism, 178
Nursery Schools, 39, 73, 269

Orientation of parents, 61, 65
Organic tension, 249
Overholtzer, Mildred, 194

Parent-teacher associations, 261, 266
Park, Robert E., 181
Paynter, Richard H., 22, 273
Personality studies, 45
Petrarch, 55
Phantasy, 200
Phelps, William Lyon, 253
Play, 107
Pound, Dean Roscoe, 10
Premature Stabilization, 85
Prestige, 54
Primary groups, 115
Primitive peoples, 110
Privacy, 55
Probation, definitions of, 4, 5
Prolongation of youth, 100, 106
Property right in children, 126
Protection, 121
Physical handicap, 69

Reeve, Margaretta Willis, 262
Respect, 47
Religion, 68
Responsibility, 54
Richards, Dr. B. S., 26
Richmond Inquirer, 11
Root, William T., Jr., 258
Rosanoff, Aaron J., 43, 171
Russell, Bertrand, 214

Sandburg, Carl, 11
Santayana, 301
Science, parents relation to, 40; life-story is a scientific fact, 44
Security, 48
Seiff, Dr. Leonhard, 70
Sex, 50, 113, 242
Shontz, Orfa Jean, 127, 166
Skeat, 96
Social resources, 35, 36
Sophistication, 67
Southern California Conference on Modern Parenthood, 282
Spencer, Herbert, 109
Successes, educating young children by means of, 299
Sugimota, Etsu Magaki, 49

Taft, Jessie, 50, 51
Tagore, Rabindranath, 17-29
Tannenbaum, Frank, 188
Thomas, W. G., 65, 115
Trotter, W., 187

Unmarried fathers, 143

Van Vechten, 160
Van Waters, Miriam, 14, 110
Velasquez, 104

Wallas, Graham, 176
Washington, State of, 35
Watson, John, 42
"Way of All Flesh, The," 253
Wilhelm, Richard, 13
Williams, Harold, 24, 26
Winston, L. G., 307
Woods, Elizabeth L., 171, 269, 282
Woolley, Helen Thompson, 269, 272

Yeomans, Edward, 55
Young, Kimball, 209

CHRISTIAN HERITAGE COLLEGE LIBRARY
Parents on probation,
301.427 V285p
3058276